

THE
EVANGELICAL REVIEW.

NO. VI.

OCTOBER, 1850.

ARTICLE I.

CHURCH DEVELOPMENT ON APOSTOLIC PRINCIPLES.

By S. S. Schmucker, D. D., Professor of Christian Theology in the Theological Seminary,
Gettysburg.

THE age in which we live is eminently an experimental and suggestive one, an era of contrary extremes. The intellect of civilized man, waked up from the slumber of ages, has been cast upon its own resources, and has been putting forth its most active energies. The discoveries and inventions of the physical arts and sciences, have flashed upon us in such quick succession, as to habituate us to the constant expectation of new wonders. The ball of revolution, set in motion by the reformers of the sixteenth century, has been perpetually rolling on, and has taught men to reflect on their natural rights both civil and religious; so that in politics one nation after another has attempted to assert its rights, and in religion, one sect after another has professed to present a more perfect development of Christianity.

In Germany, where infidelity has assumed its most learned type, neologians have frittered away the sense of every passage that opposed their views, by the unhallowed theory of accommodation and other false principles of exegesis; and, following the guidance of their higher criticism, falsely so called, have rejected one book after another from the sacred canon, until they have divested of all claim to inspiration, the whole, or nearly the whole of those Scriptures, which Paul affirms were

given by inspiration of God. Others, laying hold on the so-called theory of church development, justify whatever meets their views in the various corruptions of the successive ages of the church. This system rests on the acknowledged silence of the Scriptures, and even their opposition to certain matters of faith and practice confessedly found in the mediæval and modern church; such as private and auricular confession, the ceremonies and doctrine of the mass, image worship, worship of saints, angels and the virgin Mary, indulgences, &c. &c. Assuming that primitive Christianity was merely an imperfect germ, possessed of innate tendencies to progressive self-development, they maintain that all these postapostolical appendages to Christianity, of which the word of God knows nothing, or which it in principle clearly condemns, are to be regarded as the legitimate fruits of this tendency to development, and therefore properly embraced in the practice of the church of our day. By this principle the Puseyite justifies all the Semi-Romish rites and superstitions which he retains, and Rome herself, more consequent than he, vindicates the whole machinery of her corrupt and anti-scriptural establishment. Intermediate between these extremes, we behold a party characterized by inflexible dogmatism, a party which we are happy to believe finds but few advocates in the American Lutheran Church, who seem to deny that divinely secured and inalienable right and duty of man, to prove all things and hold fast what appears to him good; a party, to whom every thing old is sacred, and every thing new is vile. These retrogressive reformers, seizing hold of the church at a particular point in her onward progress of development and reformation, would give her a petrified form, a dead stereotyped uniformity for all coming time, excluding all possible further improvement or development. Justifying all the exercise of religious liberty and independent searching of the Scriptures of the men belonging to their favorite epoch, they would practically renounce for themselves all similar right and obligation. They seem not duly to appreciate the fact, that the ministry and membership of the church, are as much under immediate obligation to the Scriptures in one age as in another, and equally independent of all merely human prescriptions.

But these parties find no support in the Scriptures. When we examine the word of inspiration, we find that all these extremes are wrong. On the one hand we are told in various passages, that Jesus Christ and his religion are "the same to-day, yesterday and forever." But on the other hand, the apostle Paul tells us, that his church "*groweth*," into a holy

temple of the Lord, that it is developed amid all the various influences, social, civil, literary and scientific, thrown around it in its contact with mankind. It "groweth," until the little leaven that Jesus threw into the mass of society eighteen hundred years ago, shall have leavened earth's entire population; it "groweth," until the little band of fishermen and tentmakers, who first unfurled their banners in the vallies of Judea, have pushed their conquests over the earth; it "groweth" until the Lamb that was slain on Calvary, shall have proved himself the Lion of the tribe of Judah, and have put all enemies under his feet. It therefore becomes a question of momentous importance to every enlightened friend of the Redeemer's kingdom, In what light am I to view the present condition of the Protestant Church? Guided by the Book of Heaven, how am I to regard these denominational divisions, which are confessedly fourteen hundred years younger than Christianity itself, and form walls of partition between those, whose life proclaims in loudest terms their right to recognition as followers of the meek and lowly Jesus, whose earnest aspiration was, that his disciples "might be one," "that the world might know that he had sent them"? What relation do these sectarian organizations, and the sectarian creeds and confessions and formularies of government and discipline adopted by them, bear to the essential features of Christ's church as delineated in the records of inspiration, and to those principles of development by which that divinely guided assemblage of believers, founded on the apostles and prophets and Jesus Christ as the corner-stone, is to grow unto a holy temple in the Lord, for a habitation of God through the Spirit? These are questions affecting the general interests of the Redeemer's kingdom; questions, our answers to which must essentially influence our duties to the church, and we see not how any true and enlightened friend of Christianity, can enjoy a conscious sense of fidelity to his duty, until he has by careful, radical and prayerful study of the Scriptures settled his views on these questions.

If we would obtain clear conceptions of this subject, we must carefully discriminate between things that differ. We must distinguish between the church or assembly of professed believers, or as Paul defines it, "them that are sanctified in Christ Jesus, called to be saints, who call on the name of the Lord Jesus," and the doctrines, discipline and ritual of that church. In discussions on this subject, the term church is often vaguely employed to designate not only the church properly so called, that is, the assembly of professed believers, but

also her organic law, her doctrines, discipline, forms of government, judicatories and mode of worship. And the Romanists and Puseyites even confer a corporate personality on this dead organic constitution, apart from the living members who are to be governed by it, and by whom alone its preceptive character is shown forth in living action. But such vagueness of nomenclature, must necessarily preclude precision of thought or logical consequence in reasoning; for, however just a predicate that is affirmed, or however logical a deduction that is drawn, if it be doubtful to what subject they are applicable, of course they add nothing to the treasures of our knowledge. The church properly so called, may be viewed from different standpoints, and may be considered, as ideal and real, as objective and subjective, as pure or corrupt, as visible and invisible, as militant and triumphant. Without entering into a discussion of these classifications, it is enough to remark, that on the present occasion we have in view the visible church, or the assembly of the professed believers in Jesus Christ, a collection of individual persons not of things; or as the Augsburg Confession justly defines it: "*Est autem ecclesia congregatio sanctorum, in qua evangelium recte docetur et recte administrantur sacramenta.*"

What things, then, constitute the unchangeable foundation, the essential bases of Christianity, which are to remain the same from the time of their first promulgation by the Savior and his apostles, throughout all ages of the church, "always unto the end of the world."

In laying down our general position, we premise the grand fundamental principle of Protestantism, that *the word of God is a sufficient rule of faith and practice*. If any amongst us do not believe this, they are Romanists at heart and should honestly avow it. If this principle be true, it follows, that all intelligent, all sincere and faithful readers of this word, will arrive at a belief of every thing necessary to their salvation; and the points in which the great mass of them agree, may safely be regarded as certainly taught in the sacred volume. Some few individuals of intelligence, sincerity and fidelity may, through some intellectual idiosyncrasy, differ from the rest on some vital point; but their obliquity is outweighed and must be corrected by the concurrent judgment of the mass. As the great body of intelligent, evangelical, faithful *Protestants* are free, sincere and faithful searchers of the Scriptures, we arrive at the inference, that they will attain a belief of all that is necessary to salvation, and that the doctrines and duties which they unitedly find in Scripture, are certainly taught there. The

Roman Catholics cannot be taken into account here, for they are not *free* inquirers after Scripture truth. The laity confessedly resign their judgment to the priests, and the priests have bound themselves to submit their judgment to tradition, to the opinions of the so-called fathers and the decrees of councils. The Protestant principle of the infallibility and sufficiency of the word of God, does therefore fairly authorize the position, that all those points of faith and practice, which the different orthodox and evangelical Protestant denominations agree in finding in the sacred volume, are clearly revealed in it; whilst those points on which denominations of equal piety, intelligence and fidelity differ, are not so clearly revealed. Hence it follows: *That those things are unchangeable which have, in the judgment of the great mass of the Protestant world, been clearly revealed and definitely settled in the word of God, and as far as they are thus settled, and no farther; whilst on the other hand, all things not thus definitely settled, as well as the mode of administering the organic laws and affairs of the church, not definitely determined in the Scriptures, and all matters not touched on at all in them, are left to the conscientious judgment of christians in all ages of the world.* But the subject will become clearer as we proceed to particularize.

1. *The church's rule of faith is unchangeable.* This is none other than the inspired word of God, without the adjunction of human traditions either of the Jewish elders, or Romish fathers. From this word nothing is to be subtracted, to it nothing is to be added. This word is not a textbook of physical science, as some visionary minds such as Hutchinson, Parkhurst and others vainly imagined; nor is it a *system* of theology; but it is a *popular* revelation of religious truth, and to be recognized as such in all ages. Whatever doctrines are certainly taught, and so far as taught, in this word, are unchangeable in all nations and in all time to come. These doctrinal statements are popular, and include not those systematic relations of these truths, which are superadded by theologians and theological philosophers, and form a cardinal element in the sectarian peculiarities of the present day. These doctrines are those admitted by all the so-called orthodox and evangelical denominations. A statement of these articles of ecumenical Christian faith most interesting and authentic, was adopted and published by the *Evangelical Alliance*, convened at London in 1846. Here we have the unanimous testimony of about a thousand of the most influential, active, distinguished and trustworthy servants of Christ, collected from about thirty re-

ligious denominations, and from all the prominent portions of the entire Christian world, bearing testimony to present and after ages, as to what doctrines, and aspects of doctrines they regarded as clearly revealed and also as fundamental. This summary may at the same time serve as a rallying point of union for the disciples of Christ in all lands, and in all ages to come. It is as follows:

We believe in

1. The divine inspiration, authority and sufficiency of the holy Scriptures.
2. The right and duty of private judgment in the interpretation of the holy Scriptures.
3. The unity of the Godhead, and the Trinity of Persons therein.
4. The utter depravity of human nature in consequence of the fall.
5. The incarnation of the Son of God, his work of atonement for sinners of mankind, and his mediatorial intercession and reign.
6. The justification of the sinner by faith alone.
7. The work of the Holy Spirit, in the conversion and sanctification of the sinner.
8. The divine institution of the Christian ministry, and the obligation and perpetuity of the ordinances of baptism and the Lord's supper.
9. The immortality of the soul, the resurrection of the body, the judgment of the world by our Lord Jesus Christ, with the eternal blessedness of the righteous, and the eternal punishment of the wicked.

Entirely coincident with this is the summary lately published by the Synod of our church in Maryland, as an expression of their judgment as to what doctrines are fundamental to the Christian religion. And both agree in every doctrine with the so-called Apostles' Creed, and the still earlier summary of the faith of the the universal church framed and lauded by Irenæus of the second century, as the acknowledged and ample basis of Christian union throughout the world. Other doctrines of minor importance were never introduced into any Christian creed during the earlier centuries of the church, and we know of no scriptural authority for making any other doctrines the ground of divisions among the disciples of Christ.

Among these doctrines, that concerning Jesus Christ the eternal Son of God and Savior of men, is the life-giving principle, which pervades and animates and stamps the impress of

divinity on the whole system. It is the foundation of our faith and the corner-stone of the church, in or by whom (*is* ω) the building is fitly held together, and firmly sustained. As the walls of a building are bound together by the corner-stone, so the doctrine of the redemption of the world by the Son of God, and the plan of salvation through his blood, are the grand doctrinal foundation-stone of Christianity. Hence also we derive an important canon for testing the accuracy of inferential doctrinal propositions and their systematic adjustment, namely: *Every such inference or adjustment, which detracts from the importance of the Savior, which removes or disparages him as the central sun of the system, must be wrong.*

2. *The church's rule of duty is unchangeable.*

This is founded and grounded on the apostles, prophets and Jesus Christ. This law lays down the eternal principles of right and wrong, of virtue and vice, and is a reflection of the perfections of the deity. Virtue and vice always will and must be opposed in all their intrinsic tendencies, and hence the fallacy of the doctrine of German philosophy, that heresy in its proper place is necessary for the better development of truth, and therefore in certain circumstances more desirable than the absence of it; in short, that a salutary discipline of sinning, is a requisite training for the highest perfection of christian character. To this figment of philosophical imagination we respond: God may and often does overrule the crimes and heresies of men to his glory; yet crimes and heresies are in their nature and intrinsic tendencies evil, and only evil, and that continually. If every event in the history of the church were right, and intrinsically tended to greater good; then every thing done by individuals in the church is right, for in the production of the events of church history, individuals always figure as the agents. If every thing done by individuals in the church is right, then every thing done by others out of the church is right, for there is no form of vice or crime, of which some wicked men in the church have not been guilty. But, if the actions of men in and out of the church are right, then all difference between virtue and vice is obliterated, and the infidel maxim of Bolingbroke, "Whatever is, is right," claims our assent. Instead of being any longer regarded as a maxim of unbelievers, it must be baptized as Christian truth. The philosophical dreams of those German theologians, who regard the age of the apostles, the middle ages and the period of the Reformation as three progressive and successively higher states or developments of the church, thus making the darkness of

the middle ages an advance on apostolic light, are subversive of the fundamental principles of New Testament Christianity. The age of inspiration, when the church was administered by heaven-directed men, must have been the most pure and perfect, if there was any inspiration at all. If uninspired teachers are the best the church has enjoyed, then inspiration was useless, or rather, is a mere fiction. There is no such thing as inspiration, and the apostles of Jesus were not inspired. Is it said, Christianity in its full purity and highest perfection, would not have been adapted to the capacity of the Jews and Gentile nations of the apostolic age? Much less would Christianity, in its present more fully developed form, be suited to the less intelligent and less civilized heathen of modern ages. And as Christianity, on this theory, continues to reach still higher development, whilst the unchristianized heathen make no progress in intellectual improvement, it is evident, that this discrepancy, this want of adaptation in the developed teachings of the church to the necessities of the heathen, must be continually increasing; and we would be irresistibly borne on to the absurd conclusion, that the more perfectly Christianity is developed, the less is it suited to be the instrument for converting the unevangelized nations of the world.

3. *The essential features of the church's organic, visible constitution and administration are unchangeable.*

Designing his church for universal extension, and foreseeing that the reflex influence of its government on the civil institutions of nations, would awaken the suspicions of political rulers, our Savior and his apostles settled only the general principles of church government, and a few specific statutes, leaving all the rest to the judgment of believers in different ages, to be accommodated to the genius of the people and the civil institutions of nations. Had he prescribed a detailed organization for the church in all ages, it would, doubtless, have been republican, and would have entirely precluded a union with the state. Hence, there would have been some semblance of ground for the objection of kings and despots, that it forms an *imperium in imperio*, hostile to the principles of their governments, which must therefore be controlled by the civil authorities. These fundamental features, determined in Scripture, are

1. *Visible membership*, conferred by *Baptism*, as the initiatory rite. Every visible body must have some visible mode, or term, of admission; hence, although an individual by conversion becomes a member of the invisible church of God, he

is not a member of the visible church, until he is made such by baptism. "Per quem (baptismus) primitus in Christianorum communionem coöptamur." Lutheri Cat. maj.

2. *The Lord's Supper*, stately celebrated as a habitual badge of discipleship, "to show forth the Lord's death till he come."

3. *The Word of God*, or revealed truth, as the grand appointed instrumentality of the Holy Spirit in the conversion and sanctification of sinners. This word is either *oral*, as proclaimed by the living minister; or *recorded*, as in the written and printed word; or *symbolical*, as set forth by the sacraments. Divine truth is the grand means of grace, and whatever be the manner, in which it is conveyed to the sinner's mind, if rightly received, it will be blessed of God for his spiritual benefit.

The notion, of Christ's having made himself perpetually incarnate in the membership of his church through the sacraments, and of his now dispensing the gifts of the Spirit, not directly to the individual, who publicly or privately hears or reads the truth, or addresses himself in prayer to God; but of his having in the beginning deposited those gifts in the hands of the apostles alone, to be transmitted through their successors, by means of the sacraments, to the church in all after ages,—this notion or collection of notions, is nothing but a human invention, mainly of papal origin, designed to glorify an aspiring priesthood, rather than a condescending God. On the contrary, it is the word of God, which is quick and powerful, sharper than a two-edged sword. It is by "the incorruptible seed of the word," that we are "regenerated." "Sanctify them by thy truth, thy word is truth," said the blessed Savior himself.

4. *The gospel ministry*, as the appointed functionaries to proclaim and expound this word. Preach the gospel to every creature, said the departing Savior. And said Paul to his son in the faith: "The things which thou hast heard of me among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also. The power of electing and inducting, that is, ordaining these ministers, is ultimately vested in the members of the church, and at ordination, some other pastor or pastors, that is, existing elders or bishops (ministers,) should usually officiate. It may also properly be referred to Synods or Presbyteries, on the ground of human expediency. Yet, if the aid of no other pastor can be obtained, those who had authority to elect and appoint, i. e. ordain, an apostle in the place of the traitor Judas, (Acts 1: 21-26,) have also authority to appoint, or ordain, an ordinary minister. Thus thought

Luther, Melancthon, and their co-laborers, whence it is evident what value they placed on the Romish and Puseyite imposition of hands, and transmission of the sacred office and mystic influence by apostolical succession of bishops! In the Appendix to the Smalcald Articles, § 70-72. we read: "This is also evident from the common practice of the churches. Because, formerly the people elected the preachers and bishops; then came the bishop of the same or a neighboring place, and confirmed the bishop elect, by the imposition of hands; and at that time *ordination* was nothing else than such a confirmation. (Bestätigung, Latin original, *comprobatio, approbation*)"—"Hence it is evident, that the church has power to elect and *ordain* her officers. Therefore, if the bishops are either heretics, or will not ordain qualified persons, it is the sacred duty of the church, by divine right, to ordain ministers and church officers for themselves."¹ And, says Luther, "Wherever the preaching of the gospel is sustained, there is certainly the Christian church and the kingdom of Christ, no matter how small be the cluster of its professors."²

5. The *power* of administering, according to the dictates of Scripture and reason, the government and discipline of the church; of admitting applicants to membership, and of excluding them for sufficient reasons from the privileges of God's people.³ Although men may differ in applying this import-

¹ Hieraus sieht man dass die Kirche Macht hat Kirchendiener (Latin original, ministros,) zu wählen und *ordiniren*. Darum wenn die Bischöffe entweder Ketzer sind, oder tüchtige Personen nicht wollen *ordiniren*, sind die Kirchen vor Gott, nach göttlichem Recht, schuldig ihnen selbst Pfarrherrn und Kirchendiener zu *ordiniren*. See also Apology to Conf. Art. xiii, § 12.

See likewise proof of the same fact in Neander's History, and Gieseler Ecc. Hist. p. 158, Note 4, of Vol. I.

² Walch's Luth. vol. 5, p. 1418. "wie geringe oder wenig solch Häuflein auch ist."

³ This power of the church is sometimes designated the "*power of the keys*," *potestas clavium*. In the Lutheran church of Germany, this power of the keys was supposed to include also the power of declaratively forgiving sins in private confession and absolution.

The Heidelberg Catechism defines "the keys of the kingdom of heaven," to be the preaching of the gospel and ecclesiastical discipline, by which heaven is opened to believers and closed to unbelievers, "quibus coelum credentibus aperitur, infidelibus autem clauditur."

Some other divines divide the entire power of the church into three species, 1. *δογματικὴν*, or doctrinal, which relates to the doctrines of the faith, the preaching of the word and administration of the sacraments. 2. *διατακτικὴν*, or administrative, regulative, governing, which relates to the government of the church and the framing and altering of ecclesiastical laws and constitutions. And 3. *διακριτικὴν*, or judicial and disciplinary power, or the right of disciplining, of censuring, suspending and excommunicating offenders, and restoring the penitent.

ant principle in the affairs of the church, they all agree in the general principle itself, and maintain that it is the duty of each church to exercise its conscientious judgment. This general principle, therefore, is unalterable, and every pure church should vindicate these rights to itself, whilst variety and improvement in the application of this principle, may justly constitute an element of church development. The judicial power of the church is purely declarative: the Bible being her juridical code, and her decisions being valid only because, and as far as they accord with the inspired word.

In short, the church is a divinely appointed institution, wielding power and influence, that reach the throne of God. These powers are inherent in every individual congregation or church of Christ; for in the apostolic age, the churches stood in no organic connection with one another, but each congregation or church, was independent of every other. The idea that the different churches or congregations in postapostolic ages, have, by uniting in Synods or Assemblies or Denominations, acquired any additional powers different from those possessed by the churches under the apostles, cannot be admitted. It would involve the absurdity, that the church was organized more properly by uninspired ministers, than by the heaven-directed men whom Christ himself selected; and that the apostolic churches possessed less power, than the churches of later ages. If, moreover, the combinations of churches, as they arose in successive ages, acquired additional powers, and different in kind from what they previously possessed, where is the Scripture passage, by which such powers are either promised or conferred? The truth appears to be, that these synthetic ecclesiastical bodies, whether they be styled Synods, Assemblies, or Conventions, &c. possess no powers different in kind, from those originally belonging to individual churches, consisting of the members and elders or presbyters worshipping together. To these synthetic bodies, however, some of these elemental powers have been delegated by the congregations constituting them, and thus Synods &c. may act with more efficiency and exert a greater influence by a union of strength. "Wherever the church exists," say the Confessors, "there is the command to preach the gospel. Therefore the churches must retain the power of calling, electing and ordaining church officers." "To

¹ "Denn wo die Kirche ist, da ist je der Befehl das Evangelium zu predigen. Darum müssen die Kirchen die Gewalt behalten, dass sie Kirchendienern fordern, wählen und ordiniren. — Hieher gehören die Sprüche Christi, welche zeugen, dass die Schlüssel der ganzen Kirchen und nicht etlichen sondern Personen gegeben sind, wie der Text sagt, Wo zween oder drei in

this subject the declarations of Christ refer, which testify that the keys were given to the whole church and not to several particular persons, agreeably to Matth. 18: 20. "*Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there I am in the midst of them.*"

4. *The essential features of the worship of the church*, have also been determined, and are unchangeable. These are reading and expounding the word of God; prayer, singing psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, and administering the sacraments. But the times, places and manner of conducting this worship, are, in many respects, left to the experience and peculiar circumstances of every successive age. These are the features of our holy religion, which admit no change, no development. As Protestants adhering to the plenary inspiration and sufficiency of the Scriptures, we hold that whatever is distinctly enjoined in them, cannot be subject to human caprice or change. Hence arises the obligation of every individual Christian, and of Christians united in Church relations, with the moral noblemen of Berea, to search the Scriptures daily, that they may faithfully adhere to this rule. Accordingly the illustrious reformers, Luther, Zwingli, Calvin and others, not only rejected the unscriptural prescriptions of the church before their day, though confirmed by the sanction of successive centuries; but Melancthon in the Treatise on the Power of the Papacy, appended to the Smalcald Articles, urges it on kings and princes as a duty, to restrain the power of the popes, so that the church, that is, the assembly of professed believers, may not be deprived of her power to judge and determine *all things in accordance with the word of God*. (*Ne ecclesiæ eripiatut facultas judicandi et decernendi de verbo Dei. Tractatus de potestate et primatu papæ, p. 351.*)

It is indeed true, the facts embraced in the revelation of God in general, and even those of the New Testament in particular, constituting the historical basis of Christianity, were of progressive occurrence. They transpired under the miraculous guidance of God, and the record of them, and of the doctrinal

meinem Namen versammelt sind, bin ich mitten unter ihnen," &c. Smalc. Art. App.

Says Dr. Mosheim, "Although all the churches were in the first age of Christianity, united together in one common bond of faith and love, and were in every respect, ready to promote the interest and welfare of each other by a reciprocal interchange of good offices, yet, with regard to government and internal economy, every individual church considered itself as an independent community, none of them ever looking beyond the circle of its own members for assistance, or recognizing any sort of external influence or authority." *De Rebus Christ. ante Constantinum. Sec. I. § 48.*

manifestations of Christianity, were also progressive and gradual. Yet at the close of the apostolic age, with the death of the last apostle John, the canon and succession of inspired teachers of Christianity were closed, and Christianity *historically, doctrinally and didactically, became a fixed fact, a finished system, to which no inspired additions were to be made.*

Such, then, being the unchangeable foundation of the church of Christ, we are now prepared for the next inquiry :

What is its progressive superstructure or development ?

In order that the foregoing revelation of divine truth, should accomplish the end designed by God, it is necessary that those truths should be received and understood by men, and should influence the head and heart of all. For this purpose, God has appointed a system of instrumentalities, by which they will be published to the world, and the society of those who receive them be regulated in all their actions, applying to the ever-changing circumstances of successive ages, those general principles and directions, according to their best judgment. And here is the principal seat and occasion of that gradual growth or development of the church, which is the subject of our inquiry. *It manifests itself in the different degrees of perfection, with which men apprehend the truths of revelation and the relations which encircle them, and in the progressive improvement of Christians in the administration of the appointed instrumentalities of the church, guided by the increasing light of universal science and the changes in the civil condition of nations, amid the developments of God's providence and the light of God's Spirit.* Nor have these changes always been for the better. There were times, when the disciples delighted to dwell with one accord in the temple, breaking bread from house to house, and eating their meat with gladness and singleness of heart; and as a consequence of this, "the Lord added to the church daily those that were saved." But on the other hand, at times there were contentions among the disciples, one saying I am of Paul, and another I am of Apollos, and a third I am of Cephas, thus proving, as Paul tells the Corinthians, that they were carnal, "biting and devouring one another and often consuming one another." 1 Cor. 1: 12. 3: 3. Gal. 5: 15. Whilst at one time the ministry lifted up their voices, and with fidelity declared the whole counsel of God, and the church was edified: at others there was "a falling away"; wolves entered the fold in sheep's clothing; false teachers privily brought in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them, and brought

upon themselves and the victims of their delusions swift destruction.

But let us particularize. We need scarcely say, that the church, 1. "*groweth*," or is developed *numerically*. In the beginning the disciples of the Savior were but few. At a census of the church, taken in the infancy of her history, we are told "the number of names was one hundred and twenty." Afterward, especially after the Holy Spirit had descended on the disciples at Pentecost, thousands were added in a day. Twenty-one years after the death of the Savior, the Roman historian Tacitus informs us, that Christians abounded, not only in Judea where Christianity originated, but also in other countries, not even excepting Rome itself. In about three centuries so large a portion of the entire Roman empire had embraced this holy religion, that the Emperor Constantine, partly from conviction of its truth, but partly also from state policy, declared it the religion of the empire; and at present the nominally Christian population of the earth, is rated at two hundred millions of souls.

Equally obvious is the position, that the church

2. *Is developed geographically*. At first, although the Savior had explicitly declared the field to be "the world," yet, in point of fact the actual limits of the church were confined to Palestine, to the "lost sheep of the house of Israel." But soon it took partial possession of adjoining countries, extending even to Rome itself. In the second century, it gained a foothold in Armenia, Syria, Arabia, Babylonia, in Asia Minor and parts of Africa and Europe. In the third century, extensive settlements of Christians were made in France, Scotland, Spain and Germany. In the fourth century Christianity was extended into India, among the Saracens in Africa, along the Rhine and in Ireland. Thus was our holy religion extended from one country into another until it also took possession of this Western world. At present the Christian church is spread over a large part of the world; and although three-fourths of the population of the earth are yet heathen, Christianity has gained a foothold in the principal heathen nations, and paganism is tottering by its own intrinsic weakness, beneath the superincumbent weight of its superstitions and idolatry. But it is not our design to dwell on the numerical or geographical growth of the church: we therefore pass on to its other features of development.

3. *The church is developed ritually*. The essential parts of stated worship of the church, as we have above affirmed, are fixed, namely, reading and expounding the word of God, singing

and prayer. These cannot be omitted or changed, and the Romish church was doubtless guilty of a gross perversion of the appointed worship of the sanctuary, in almost entirely omitting the reading and preaching the word, and superceding them by the protracted ceremonies of her pompous ritual. So entirely unusual was preaching in the Romish church before the Reformation, that the Protestant ministry, who restored it to its primitive place, were so peculiar in this respect, that they were popularly designated as the "*preachers*," from which circumstance, this name of the Christian ministry originated.¹

But nearly all the circumstances and modes, for the performance of these duties, were left to be regulated by the judgment and conscience of Christians in different ages and countries according to their peculiar circumstances, and the progressive lessons of experience, guided by apostolic example. Thus in regard to *preaching the word*, it is undecided, how often, whether only on the Lord's day, or whether also in the week and in protracted meetings; also how long our sermons should be, where they should be delivered in churches only, or also in private houses, or in the open air as at camp-meetings and other convocations: and, finally, it is undetermined, whether our discourses shall be written or extemporaneous, whether they may be read, or must be delivered without the aid of the manuscript. In regard to *prayer*, it is left to the judgment of Christians, how long, how loud they should be; how many should occur in each service, and whether they should be pre-composed and read, or be extemporaneous. From the New Testament and Justin Martyr we learn, that they were extemporaneous in the primitive age of the church, for, says he, each one prayed, "*ὅση δύναμις αὐτοῦ*," as well as he could. The most learned and recent investigations confirm the opinion, that written prayers as well as liturgies were introduced generally in the fourth² and fifth centuries, to aid incompetent ministers, who could not conduct the public services well without them, (Siegel III. p. 205,) especially amid the decline of learning in the Roman empire. The true state of the case is given by the recent German Archeologist, Siegel, in his "*Handbuch der Christlich-kirchlichen Alterthümer*,"³ and is worthy of citation: "But after the most distinguished Christian teachers had

¹ "Der Spottname, *predicantes*, den die Römischen Schriftsteller den Lutherschen Pfarrern gaben, gereichte ihnen zur Ehre, und ist in neueren Zeiten an manchen Orten allgemein recipirt; ob er gleich (Prediger) zu eng ist, um das ganze Geschäft eines evangelischen Pfarrers zu bezeichnen."—Bretschneider's Entwicklung, p. 799.

² Coleman's Christ. Antiq.

³ Leipzig, 1838, 4 vols. 8vo.

passed from the stage, and had been succeeded by others of inferior education; when barbarism and ignorance were making continued inroads on the Roman empire, and the mysterious portions of worship¹ in a measure disappeared from Christianity, or at least assumed a different form and import even in regard to its terms; then the clergy, who felt unequal to the task of animating the religious assemblies by their own powers of mind, found themselves compelled to have recourse to written directories, which were soon composed and furnished by obliging individuals. This was the origin of these formularies which are known under the names of Liturgies and Missals, which, as we shall shortly see, were fictitiously attributed to distinguished men, and even to apostles in order to confer on them greater importance. That such formularies existed as early as the time of the emperor Justinian, is evident from the 137th *novellus*,² which requires bishops prior to their ordination, to subscribe the creed, and repeat the formulary which was used in celebrating the eucharist, and the prayer for baptism, as well as also other prayers. Most probably the close of the fifth century is the period at which it became customary, in the chief cities, to write down these formularies. From this time it was usual, as well in other respects as especially in the ceremonies of worship, to aim at more general uniformity, and the smaller churches copied after the formularies of those in larger and capital cities. Moreover, the constantly increasing ignorance and indolence of the clergy, may have contributed something to the gradual formation of this custom. The industry of *Bingham*, who labors to prove from individual passages, that such standing written formularies had existed as early as the second century, is unavailing. For those passages accurately examined, either do not establish the point in question, or they refer only to individual, rare cases, which cannot prove the existence of a general custom."

The same general position is sustained by Baumgarten and the other ablest archeologists. Yet it is also certain, that individual instances of forms of prayer may be traced to the second century. But the New Testament affords not a shadow of evidence, that the apostles and primitive christians repeated the Lord's prayer, as a stated part of their public worship. Even the evangelists (Matth. 6 : 9-13. Luke 11 : 1-4.) record

¹ Certain secret rites, borrowed from the heathen mysteries, and concealed from the vulgar.

² This was the designation given in Roman law, to those later and supplementary laws, which were added to the Justinian code, and formed a part of the Corpus Juris.

it with variations, and in all the instances of prayer by Jesus and his disciples, no trace of any uniform, prescribed form of prayer is found. Acts 1: 24. 4: 24-31. 9: 40. 12: 5. 20: 36. &c. Nevertheless, the intrinsic excellence of this prayer, its divine authority, and the circumstances under which it was delivered, have very properly led to its occasional use in Christian worship.

It is, therefore, reserved to the judgment of christians of every age, whether they will use any prescribed forms of prayer or not, and whether they will combine them with extemporaneous supplications. And so also in *regard to singing*, it is enjoined that christians should sing, as a part of their stated worship. Col. 3: 16. "Admonishing one another in psalms (*ψαλμοί*) and hymns (*ὕμνοι*, perhaps such as Exod. 15: 5. Deut. 32: 33. Gen. 49. Judges 5. Isaiah 33. 2 Sam. 1: 17. &c. national songs and elegies of the Jews,) and spiritual songs," *ὠδαὶ πνευματικαί*, poetic effusions of independent character, such as are now termed hymns. But what kind of versions should be used in different nations, whether literal, like Rouse's rude and prosaic version of the psalms, or more free, like the elegant, poetic and devotional work of Dr. Watts, is undetermined, as also what tunes shall be employed, amid the vast variety produced by different ages. It is therefore evident, that the psalmody, hymnology and sacred music of the church, form suitable and important topics of legitimate church development, and will strongly sympathize with the progress of poetry and music in general, as is seen in the history of this part of worship, especially from the establishment of singing schools, in the sixth century, till the present time.

In our American Lutheran Church, we have happily struck upon the middle path. We have a liturgy of moderate length, expressing the prevailing judgment of our church on the different parts of public worship, which tends to produce a substantial similarity of worship. Yet these forms are not binding; and each minister, with his congregation, possesses the liberty, to make as much or little use of them as he may judge best. If settled uniform modes of prayer and other services, were best calculated to excite devotion, they would doubtless have been provided by God's word; and therefore the church should ever retain and vindicate a reasonable liberty in all those matters, not determined in the Scriptures. It seems to have been the design of God that the mind of each worshipper and congregation in every age, and throughout all centuries, should in worship be brought into constant and im-

mediate contact with the divine word, so that the truth, as holy men of God spake it, in its inspired relations and connexions, should operate on the intellect and heart of the church in every period of her history.

The complaint has been heard, in ceaseless iteration from a hundred voices for some years past, uttered, in some cases, by good men, with the best of motives, and reëchoed by the enemies of revivals and of practical godliness, to justify their own lifelessness and formalism, that some of our churches have indulged too much in an emotional religion; have yielded themselves too much to the dominion of feeling, in worship. The charge is true; and we have, as is well known, always been a strenuous advocate for strict order in worship. But the charge is no less one-sided than true. For every one of our churches, that was inclined to fanaticism, we have at least a dozen chained down in the frozen embrace of formality, in whom the life of religion has disappeared, and the conversion of sinners has become a rare occurrence. But of these we hear little complaint, and an increased use of the liturgy, is urged, to curb the flights of feeling. If, then, the use of forms and confessions will tend to restrain the irregularities of the one party, let us beware lest it also tend to confirm the lifeless formalism of the other. At least, we feel deeply impressed with the conviction, that more caution is requisite, and more danger to be apprehended from the latter than the former source; nor can we doubt, that our Divine Master regards with greater abhorrence a lifeless formalism, destitute of the power of godliness, than the earnest zeal of his worshippers, even when it occasionally does outstrip their knowledge, and run into confusion.

4. The church "groweth" or develops herself *juridically*, that is, in all that is undetermined in Scripture concerning her mode of government and discipline. Those principles prescribed in God's word should be retained, but all the other numerous arrangements, necessary to carry out the duties of the church, should be accommodated to the genius, the civil government, the manners and customs of different nations and ages. If diversities of duties are assigned to particular individuals by the church, there should be nothing done conflicting with the natural rights of the church-members, and the parity by *divine right* of her ministers. By divine right there is no difference of rank between the incumbents of the sacred office, whether they be termed presbyters, pastors or bishops; and it is evident that ordination performed by a pastor

in his own church is by divine right valid.' Upon this ground we should reject, as conflicting with correct principles, Papacy, Episcopacy claiming divine right, the acknowledgment of kings or civil rulers as earthly heads of the church, and the union between church and state. But the different forms of Presbyteries or Synods, and General Synods, and Conferences or Conventions, may all be regarded as modifications of the conventional principle embodied in the council of Jerusalem, attended by the apostles, elders or ministers and lay brethren. The various systems of church discipline practiced in this country by the Lutherans, the Congregationalists, the Presbyterians, the Moravians and Methodists, are of similar nature, and constitute a proper field for church development.

In the same light must *Creeds* or *Confessions* be regarded. They are not enjoined in Scripture, they were not used in the apostolic churches. Yet the good sense of the church soon taught the utility of a creed, long enough to exclude fundamental errorists from the church, and yet not so long as to infringe on that liberty of conscience in nonfundamentals, which is the birthright of every man, and *the vindication of which is essential to the successful development and progress of the church.* For this purpose the so-called Apostles' Creed² suf-

¹ "Weil aber nach göttlichem Recht kein Unterschied ist zwischen Bischöfen und Pastoren oder Pfarrern, ist ohne Zweifel wenn ein Pfarrer in seiner Kirche etliche tüchtige Personen zu Kirchenämtern ordnet, dass solche Ordination nach göttlichen Rechten kräftig und recht ist." The original Latin is more brief: *Sed quum jure divino non sint diversi gradus episcopi et pastoris, manifestum est ordinationem a pastore, in sua ecclesia factam, jure divino ratam esse.* Smalcald Art. Appendix de Potestate et Primatu Papæ, &c. p. 341. Müller's ed.

² This creed was termed "apostolic," probably because, by common consent, it contained the prominent doctrines taught by the apostles. It was unknown in the first, second, and third centuries; and even in the middle of the fourth, that most learned historian of the Christian church, Eusebius, knew nothing of it. The first mention, and the earliest record of it, are found in Rufinus, who lived in the latter part of the fourth, and the beginning of the fifth century. Yet he states, that tradition traced it, by oral transmission, to the apostles. The Romish figment, that the apostles composed it at a council held just before they started into the different parts of the world, each apostle framing a part of it, has long since been exploded. Several of the Christian fathers have given us statements of the doctrines, universally believed by the church in their day, and required as a term of admittance, such as Irenæus in the second, and Tertullian in the third century. These substantially agree with that, given by Rufinus, and called by him the "Apostolical Creed," only the first is longer, and the second shorter than his, which was probably formed from them. Neither of the three contains the clause, concerning the descent of Jesus into hell, or hades. If the primitive church had possessed such a creed, *written by the apostles*, it would not only be found in the Christian writers of the first three centuries and be referred to by them, but would have been gladly received into the canon of the New Testament, as possessing au-

ficed for several centuries, and the Nicene, which is little longer, was added in the fourth century. Subsequent fundamental errors would naturally have justified some brief additions; but the history of the Protestant churches, which is little else than a history of intestine contentions about non-fundamentals, demonstrates, that the creeds under which they acted are entirely too long, and violate the apostolic injunction, "the brother that is weak in the faith," that is, whom ye regard as entertaining some errors of faith, "receive ye, but not to doubtful disputations." Rom. 14: 1. Yes, we regard it as a lesson clearly taught by the Providence of God in the history of the Protestant churches, and especially of the mother church of the Reformation, which bears the name of the immortal Luther, that *her creeds are entirely too long*, the number of doctrines and collateral aspects of doctrines there determined, is entirely too great. This judgment the good sense of a large part of the church in Europe pronounced in the beginning, by refusing to receive some of these books. The same estimate is clearly demonstrated by the judgment and sentiments of many of her noblest sons known in her history as Melancthonians, and Sacramentarians and Cryptocalvinists, who all felt that the points of difference between them and the Reformed, ought not to be made symbolical, nor permitted to put asunder those, whom God hath joined together by the unity of the Spirit, by unity in all the doctrines that were required for ecclesiastical union by the christians of the first four centuries after Christ and even more. Our fathers, therefore, exhibited a just appreciation of the lessons of history, when, half a century ago, they relinquished all requisition of a formal pledge to this mass of former symbolical books, though they continued to believe all the cardinal doctrines taught in them; and practically required only implied belief in the fundamentals of the gospel, as taught in the Augsburg Confession. The General Synod of our church did but reduce to writing, and thus embody in their organic law the wise and liberal practice of our fathers, when they required every candidate for licensure or ordination to make the same pledge in a formal manner. And God has signally blessed the doctrinal basis they assumed. To the enumeration of these fundamental articles, published by the

thority equal to the other writings of the apostles, yea, even superior to them, being the joint work of them all. The probability is, that an oral creed, substantially like that of Irenæus, Tertullian and Rufinus, was used in the church as early as the second and third centuries, though like all oral traditions, it varied in different places and ages, and one form of it was just as much apostolic as the other, that is, they all contained doctrines taught by the apostles.

Synod of Maryland, we see no objection. It gives distinctness to the pledge, and definitely marks its limits. But the position of the so-called old Lutherans of Germany, and of some portions of our own Western States, seems to us evidently a contracted, short-sighted one. It ignores the teachings of history, and the lessons of divine Providence. It resists the proper development of the church of Christ, whilst it attempts to perpetuate the minor peculiarities of Luther and a part of his immediate successors. It almost deifies one man of God, whilst it counts as nought the labors and studies and prayers of a thousand other divines of the same church, as learned as he, and equally pious, who commenced their labors in possession of all the light, which Luther's life of prayer and labor gave him; and yet supposes, that by equal fidelity and study, they accomplished nothing, and he did every thing! That the day will arrive when these men will see and lament their error, we cannot doubt. They will find that they are wounding the Savior in the house of his friends!

5. The church "groweth," is developed, *exegetically*.—The Bible being a revelation from the God of heaven, many christians of the earlier ages supposed it must be interpreted on principles of exegesis, different from those applied to human compositions. Origen especially, who was among the first that theorized on this subject, attributed three different senses to the Scriptures, the grammatical, the moral, and the mystical, which latter he subdivided into two classes, the analogical and the allegorical. The numerous wild and fanciful notions, to which these false principles conducted this otherwise estimable and learned father, are well known. In later days, and especially since the Reformation, great progress has been made in the interpretation of the word of God. The Romish church at an early day, adopted the tradition of the fathers as her rule of interpretation; yet the fallacy of this rule is evident, when we reflect that these fathers adopted every variety of theological sentiments. That there has been great development, or improvement made in the interpretation of the Scriptures since the Reformation, no one acquainted with the subject will deny. At last, after passing through various fluctuations in the neological schools of Germany, this science has settled down on the principles of common sense, designated the *historical interpretation*, which will not, we think, soon be again shaken. It is now admitted, that in making a revelation to men, in order that it might be intelligible, God must necessarily use language in the sense, in which it was understood by those to whom it was addressed; and that the

Scriptures must therefore be interpreted on the same principles, which are applied to uninspired human compositions. Much light has also been reflected on some portions of Scripture by the fulfillment of *prophecy*, in which the developments of providence in the history of the world, have exhibited the most striking displays of divine prescience, and fixed the import of some passages formerly enveloped in darkness. Vast improvement has also been made in the science of philology, and the different branches of archaeology, which throw light upon the Scriptures, such as the manners and customs, the geography and history of the nations referred to in the sacred record. Thus the labors of infidel lexicographers and linguists, have often aided the cause of biblical interpretation, and travels and explorations, prompted by mere secular motives, have frequently cast light upon the word of God. Much has in these various ways been accomplished for the interpretation of the Scriptures, and consequent development of the church, and more will still be done for the same purpose.

6. The church "groweth," or is developed, *theologically*.—This is indeed a wide field, at the mere outlines of which we have time but to cast a glance. The evidences which sustain the faith of the church in the Scriptures, have been gaining ever increasing strength by the investigations of science. The Mosaic account of the present organization of things and of the early history of the world, is confirmed by the achievements in geology, and even by the hieroglyphics of the Egyptian pyramids. The Mosaic account of the unity of our race, though now and then assailed, is clearly established by the deductions of modern ethnologists. In this department we are happy to acknowledge the obligations of our cause to the recent able publication of Dr. Bachman, one of the most distinguished divines and philosophers in our American church.

The church groweth in her *systematic* understanding of the Scriptures. In its objective totality, as delineated by the pencil of inspiration, Christianity is incapable of growth or improvement. But in our subjective apprehension of its principles and doctrines, in the adjustment of their systematic relations to one another, and in the philosophy of its facts and doctrines, it groweth into a holy temple in the Lord. The solar system was just as perfect in itself, when men supposed the earth to be an extended plain; yet our knowledge of it has been growing in every age, until even the discoveries of Copernicus are thrown into the shade. After the lustre of apostolic zeal, and the illustration of apostolic example were taken away, and after the corruptions of Judaism, of Gnosticism, of Platonism,

of Scholasticism, of Romanism and of modern philosophical science falsely so called, had corrupted the doctrines of the church and encumbered the truth, there was necessity and room for improvement in every after age, by returning to the primitive simplicity of apostolic Christianity, and by the application to the Bible of the progressive light of genuine physical and intellectual science. The Reformers succeeded in rejecting the greater part of the corruptions of Romanism; and yet something remained, to be achieved by their successors.

The facts and clearly revealed doctrines of Christianity, are unchangeable; whilst we may justly expect continued improvement in the theories of men for their explanation, and in their success in separating all such theories from the facts and doctrines themselves. As the spirit of liberality is extended over the church, and more amicable relations prevail, sectarian prejudice will exert less influence in the study of Scripture, and there will be greater agreement among christians on those doubtful and disputed points of doctrine, by which, since the Reformation, different denominations are distinguished. By continued investigations in psychological science, the practical influence of truth on the mind will be better understood, and the nature and reasonableness of conversion itself be more clearly perceived. The faithful pastor may learn to apply the truth more appropriately to the peculiar circumstances and necessities of individual sinners, and the church grow in the accuracy of her judgment as to the relative value and proper use of *old measures* and *new measures*, in the conversion of sinners and edification of saints. And, finally, on this topic, the church will grow and be gloriously developed by the increased diffusion over the Christian community, of a juster estimate and discrimination between the fundamental facts and doctrines of our holy religion, and the minor points of sectarian difference. Distinct progress has been made in the present century in this direction, and although the recent growth of Puseyism and formalism in various phases, has created a temporary diversion, our confidence is in the great Head of the church, and we trust she will continue to grow in this respect also, until all who worship Him, shall worship Him in spirit and in truth, and study to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bonds of peace; until all the different denominations of Christians can say both by word and action, "One is our master," and that is neither Luther, nor Calvin, nor Wesley, but "Christ," and, notwithstanding our minor diversities, *in Him* "we are all brethren," will bid each other God speed, and labor harmoniously side by side for the furtherance of the Gospel.

7. Finally. The church "groweth," is developed, *economically*, that is, she will continue to improve in the method of administering the appointed instrumentalities of her aggressive agency. The grand instrumentality for extending the kingdom of Christ is, and until the end of the world will be, divine truth, either oral, or written, or symbolical as in the sacraments accompanied by the influence of the Holy Spirit; but in the methods of disseminating and applying the truth, there is great variety.

For the promulgation of oral and symbolic truth, the living ministry was established. When the apostles had preached the gospel in any place and made some converts, they selected several of the most intelligent, judicious and pious among them, and appointed them as bishops, also sometimes called elders, in our day, ministers. Thus there was a plurality of ministers or bishops in the town of Ephesus, and Paul directs Timothy to ordain, not an elder, but elders or bishops in every church. These ordinarily pursued their secular profession during the week for support,¹ and labored according to their ability, in the duties of the ministry especially on the Sabbath; whilst it was customary from the beginning to provide for those who travelled as missionaries. In the progress of time more education was required, and secular business was prohibited. Yet no adequate provision was made for a respectable education of the ministers in general until after the Reformation.

¹ This fact is evident, not only from the example of the apostle Paul, who sometimes labored with his own hands; but also from his admonition to other bishops or ministers, not to engage in the pursuit of dishonest gain. 1 Tim. 3: 3. Tit. 1: 7. 11. 1 Pet. 5: 2. In these passages Luther has happily, though somewhat freely, expressed the apostle's idea, by the phrase "*unehrliche Handthierung treiben*," following a dishonest trade or profession. As the so-called *Apostolic Canons*, which subsequently prohibited secular business to the clergy, are inaccessible to many of our readers, we subjoin them. They were written about the close of the third century, when impurity had already crept into the ministry; and are indicative of the customs of that age:

Canon 6. *Neither a bishop, presbyter nor deacon shall engage in secular employment, on pain of being deposed from office.*

And the fortieth canon is as follows:

Canon 40. *We ordain that the bishop shall have the control of the congregational property. For as the precious souls of men are committed to his care, much more ought he to have the control of the church property, that he may freely arrange every thing, that he may aid the poor through the instrumentality of the presbyters and deacons, in the fear of God and in all honesty. He shall also be permitted to apply a portion of it to his own indispensable wants, if he needs it, as also for strange Christians who have come as guests; and in these cases it is not necessary to suffer any want*

Here a great advance was made by the establishment of Protestant universities, and the requisition of a regular and respectable standard of ministerial education. Another development still, was the separation of theological from classical instruction, and the establishment of distinct Theological Seminaries. The last step has been the organization of Societies, by which men of piety and talents are supported by the church in obtaining their education, and the number of ministers is greatly increased. Accordingly, we perceive, whilst the oral truth to be published, remains the same, and the persons appointed to proclaim it are the same, there has been a striking development, or progress in the mode of training these persons, and in the method of supporting them. Whilst the *written* word remained unaltered, in all ages, who does not know the amazing growth or development of the church, in the facilities for its dissemination? As long as the sacred volume could be reproduced only by the pen of the transcriber, the work progressed slowly, and the copies were so rare, that many whole congregations could not boast of an entire set of all the sacred books. But who does not know the amazing change,

(μεταλαμβάνειν δι καὶ αὐτὸν τῶν δεόντων, εἰς δεῖπνον, εἰς τὰς ἀναγκαίας αὐτοῦ χρεῖας καὶ τῶν ἐπιτερουμένων ἀδελφῶν, ὡς κατὰ μῆδενά τροποῦν αὐτοὺς ὑποτρέψαι.)

The fifty-eighth canon likewise relates to this subject :

Canon 58. *If a bishop refuse to supply the indispensable wants of a poor minister (namely from the church funds), he shall be set aside ; and if he still refuses to do it, let him be deposed as a murderer of his brethren.*¹

At the Synod of Elvira, (in Spain, near the site of the present Granada) the date of which is not entirely certain, though fixed with probability about the year 313, a restriction was imposed on ministers, by the eighteenth canon, which, however, presupposes that in Spain the secular business of ministers was not yet entirely prohibited.

Canon 18. *Bishops, elders and deacons shall not leave their place of residence for the sake of trade, nor traverse the provinces for the purposes of attending profitable fairs. They may, for the purpose of gaining a subsistence, send a son, or freedman, or hireling, or friend, or any one else ; and if they wish to pursue any secular business, let it be within their province.*²

¹ Roessler's Bibliothek der Kirchenväter, Vol. 4. p. 232, 242, 248.

² Ibid. Vol. 4. p. 230, 281. Episcopi, Presbyteri et Diacones de locis suis negotiandi causa non diacedant; nec circumeuntes provincias quaestuosas nundinas sectentur. Sane ad victum sibi conquirendum aut filium, aut libertum, aut mercenarium, aut amicum, aut quemlibet mittant, et si voluerint negotiari, infra provinciam negotientur.

produced by the invention of wooden and then metallic types, and finally by the printing press in and since the fifteenth century, propelled for several centuries by the manual power of the printer? But in the present age, even that wonder-working agent, steam, has been laid under contribution, in multiplying copies of the Bible, and thus laboring for the dissemination of divine truth! In the thirteenth century, when the price of a day's labor was three cents, it would have taken the wages of one man for fourteen years, to purchase a single copy of the Bible, which then cost about one hundred and seventy dollars; whilst at present, the price of a single day's labor will provide for any family a well-printed copy of the word of life. Nor is even this small sum indispensable. Christians have learned to understand their duty so much better, that they have organized societies for the express purpose of disseminating the word of God. In the progress of her development, the church finds a duty devolved on her, of which she was formerly ignorant. And now the circulation of this holy volume, not only keeps pace with the living teacher, but is often sent in advance to prepare the way for him. The dissemination of *religious Tracts*, and the erection of Sabbath schools, are also new features of development in the church, and no one acquainted with the vast machinery now at work in these departments, and the manifest smiles of heaven vouchsafed to them, can hesitate to regard them as important features of christian activity. Nor can we fail to recognize another step in the progressive development of the church, in the systematic form which the *Missionary enterprise* has assumed since the Reformation. The church of Christ is, in its nature, aggressive. To make disciples of all nations, was the great task assigned her; and, from the beginning, she applied herself to the work. Yet it was chiefly done by the heads of the church, without the direct coöperation of the laity. But it may be regarded as a development peculiar to this century, to enlist the services of the *great body of the laity*, by a regular system of organization, which like a net-work embraces the whole church. By the increased commercial connections and rapid transportation by steam, the church is brought into near contact with the heathen world, missionary operations have assumed a regular systematic form, and all evangelical churches participate in this glorious work. Even the *auri fames infanda*, the unhallowed thirst for gold, becomes the incidental occasion for bearing the Gospel to the coasts of the Pacific. And as one science after another illuminates the enterprise and commerce of nations, all will be compelled to bring their tribute to our

holy cause, to the development of the church. Even the progress of *republican principles* in the civil governments of Europe, must tend to develop the true principles of Christianity and the resources of the church. It will ultimately, doubtless, eventuate in a separation of church and state, and destroy that unblessed alliance between the kingdom of this world and the kingdom of Christ "which is *not* of this world," which has corrupted and secularized the church since the days of Constantine; and by calling into action the resources of the church distinctively, it will make every private member feel his responsibility, and give him full scope for the exercise of his powers. Thus we see, that the kingdom, or church of the Redeemer, is indeed "fitly framed," is based on an immovable foundation, and possessed of unchangeable fundamental features. Yet it is so constructed, that "it groweth into a holy temple," is developed under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, by the progressive experience of ages, the increasing light of physical, intellectual and moral science, the fulfilment of prophecy, and the developments of God's providence. Nor is the coöperation of that blessed, ascended Redeemer withheld, who when on earth displayed his omnipotence in his miraculous works, and to whom is given all authority (*ἐξουσία* authority, *not* *δύναμις* power,) in heaven and earth, which he employs as "head over all things for the church."

We cannot close this article, without inviting the attention of our readers to several practical lessons, which flow from our subject. If the principles here laid down are correct, it clearly follows, that our American Lutheran church of the General Synod, is organized in perfect accordance with the most comprehensive and enlightened views of Christ's kingdom, is adapted to all ages of the world, and to every stage of the church's development. On the one hand, its organization secures perfectly the unchangeable foundation of the apostles and prophets, and Jesus Christ the chief corner-stone; and on the other, leaves reasonable scope for the development of the church, under the increasing light of universal science, and the progressive instructions of God's providence. At licensure and ordination we bind ourselves to the apostles, the prophets and Jesus Christ, when we profess to receive the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, as the only infallible rule of faith and practice. We pay due respect to our ecclesiastical ancestry, and secure sufficient doctrinal uniformity, when we declare our belief that the Augsburg Confession, the mother symbol of Protestantism, presents a substantially accurate exhibition of the fundamental articles of God's word.

On the contrary, in those things left doubtful or undecided in Scripture, and referred to the judgment and progressive experience of the church, our Formula of Government and Discipline, together with the Liturgy, expresses our preference on as many points, as are necessary to harmonious coöperation; leaving the residue to the judgment and preference of individual churches and ministers. Even in the undecided points, a pleasing, prevailing uniformity is found; and if, as was the case in the apostolic churches, and as will sometimes be the case among men who think and study the Scriptures for themselves, some minor difference occurs, this may be the subject of amicable discussion in our periodicals, and those who have reason, Scripture principle, and experience on their side, will generally convince others, and thus sufficient uniformity be preserved. It has been objected to this mode of recognizing the Augsburg Confession, that it is too indefinite, and would enable a Socinian to enter our communion, if he did not regard his denial of the Savior's divinity as fundamental. But this is a radical misapprehension of the case. It must be remembered, that not the applicant but the Synod is to decide, after a full examination, whether the candidate agrees with them on all fundamental aspects of christian doctrine or not. They must first determine whether or not they will license him, before he is permitted to take the pledge to the confession. So long, therefore, as the majority of a Synod are fundamentally sound in the faith, they can easily exclude all applicants who are not so: and if the members of any Synod are themselves heterodox, no creed, however long and detailed, will induce them to require of others, what they do not believe themselves. The experience of a quarter of a century, has, moreover, demonstrated the practical sufficiency of this form of a pledge.

But let us listen to the proposed remedies for this defect. And first a preliminary word of those, who urge the unqualified adoption of the whole mass of former Lutheran symbols. Our church in this country, has uttered her judgment so decidedly on this subject, that this point may regarded as settled. Few, very few of our ministers or congregations will ever be brought so far to surrender their own judgments, or liberty of thought and investigation. As to the suggestion of those, who would have us retain those books as a whole, but at the same time adopt a set of rules, by which four or five species of matter, such as historical, exegetical, &c. shall be excluded from normative authority, it also is out of the question. Various difficulties oppress it. The adoption of such rules for expur-

gating those books, was not acknowledged by the authors of the Form of Concord, or by the Protestant princes who gave normative authority to those writings. And, if it be said, many of our ablest divines have affirmed the right of making these exceptions, we do not deny the right. But others will, with equal right, add other rules, and thus there will be none settled at last. This system would also require too much of the time of our pastors to eviscerate these books, and ascertain what portions of a volume nearly as large as the entire Bible, are normative and what are not.

Moreover, our fathers in this country, fifty years ago, dropped all the symbolic books, except the practical use of the Augsburg Confession, and the employment of Luther's minor Catechism for the instruction of the young. The General Synod has settled this point by embodying this practice in her organic law. As to all practical purposes, the only questions with us are, is it desirable to give greater definiteness to the qualified acknowledgment of the Augsburg Confession, prescribed by the General Synod, and if so, how can it be best accomplished?

Two methods to confer greater definiteness have been proposed, deserving of serious consideration. It has been suggested, that normative authority might be given to the Augsburg Confession as a whole; that those who can conscientiously do so, might subscribe it unconditionally, whilst all others should be at liberty to specify, as excepted, any points to which they could not assent, these being not essential to orthodox Christianity, or of such a nature, as to introduce confusion into the church. Among the points, for legitimate exception, the following were specified: 1) The *power of the sacraments*, but not their validity or subjects. From the fact, that power here must mean something else than validity, and from the known views of the proponent, we suppose it to include the doctrines of baptismal regeneration, and of the real or bodily presence: 2) *Our relation to the first man, Adam, and the manner in which we became involved in his sin*; but not the sinfulness of man itself, nor original sin, or the necessity of regeneration. 3) The *Communicatio idiomatum*, that is, the doctrine of an interchange of the attributes of the divine and human natures in Christ, including the position, that divine attributes are conferred on the human nature of Christ. This doctrine is, however not taught in the Augsburg Confession but in the other symbolical books, and therefore its specification at subscription might be omitted. This plan would include all the prominent topics, which we and the great mass

of our ministers desire to have kept free. Nor would we personally have any difficulty with it. Still, there are some objections to this plan. The requisition that each subscriber shall specify his exceptions, would produce a multitudinous record, some also would except more and others fewer doctrines and points. There would thus be no uniformity; and we can perceive but little advantage, in requiring each licentiate to make a public record of his views on such non-essential points, many of which he might subsequently wish to change. The other method of giving more definiteness to the pledge of the General Synod, is that of the Maryland Synod, to enumerate the doctrines and aspects of doctrine, which we regard as fundamental, and on which we adopt the statements of the Augsburg Confession as normative; thus making that Confession absolutely binding on all these enumerated points. This method, on the whole, appears to us decidedly the best. It is clear, definite, and positive: and we feel confident it will cover the real doctrinal position of every member of the General Synod. As it also allows all the doctrinal views of the old Lutheran party, it is truly catholic and tolerant. It presents no difficulty, except to those who are not tolerant themselves; and, if these find any impediment in attempting to enter the General Synod, it is so much the better for the peace and prosperity of our Zion.

Under this pledge, as also without the additional specification of fundamentals, we stand prepared to receive any light, which the age can afford us; to adapt ourselves to the divine and providential developments of millennial enterprise and glory. On this platform, every individual has room to exert his utmost power for the conversion of sinners, to devise and execute the most efficient and far-reaching plans for extending the kingdom of Christ and promoting his mediatorial glory. Standing on this ground our worthy and pious members will be strongly attached to our church, not merely by hereditary preference for our outward forms, which, under other circumstances, would make them Jews or Mohammedans, but by a far stronger, nobler bond, by the conviction, that in it they enjoy the greatest facilities for saving their souls and the souls of others. Let us, therefore, adhere to these apostolic principles. Like the immortal Luther, let us acknowledge the word of God alone, as our infallible guide. This word let us study, whilst we live. From this pure fountain, let us draw our streams of living and life-giving water. Let us respect our predecessors, but not idolize them. Let us venerate the truth which they taught; but not forswear other and further truth,

when we recognize it. Let us be careful not to interpose Luther, between ourselves and Christ or his word. Let us also inquire, whether we are availing ourselves of all the facilities tendered by the apostolic structure of our church, for glorifying God; and whilst we bless him for the religious liberty secured to us in this happy land, and for the apostolic principles of our developed, growing church, let us humble ourselves on account of our unfruitfulness, and purpose, by the grace of God, to labor with increasing zeal and fidelity in the vineyard of the Lord.

This subject also presents us a clear estimate of *the character and relations of the several evangelical Protestant denominations*. It follows, that they are several, co-equal branches of the one true church of Christ, all receiving every thing essential to the Christian religion; whilst they differ only in minor points of doctrine, points less clearly revealed in Scripture, or superadded by the ratiocinations of theologians for the purpose of adjusting the systematic relations of doctrines; and all preferring different methods of organization, discipline, or worship, in matters not settled by the Bible, as best calculated to advance the highest interests of our common and divine religion.

They are therefore different divisions of the same army of cross-bearers, of the same sacramental host, fighting under the one captain of our salvation, Jesus Christ, against the common enemies, the flesh, the world and the devil. Therefore they should not turn their weapons against one another; and the more unity of counsel and concert of action they observe, the greater efficiency will characterize their efforts, and the more rapidly will they press their conquests over the earth. They "are all brethren," whilst "one only is their Master, Christ." Therefore they should cherish fraternal love towards each other, and in prosecuting the great work assigned them, they should call no man "master" but Christ, teaching us in his word. They should suffer no human authority to intervene between him and them, or prevent them from making his word their constant, paramount rule of duty. All jealousy and hatred between these different divisions of the church, should be discountenanced. The disposition to magnify and give prominence to the points of difference, though it may confirm the frame-work of sectarianism, tend to glorify a particular denomination, and minister to sectarian pride, is certainly hostile to the unity of the spirit and bond of peace, enjoined in revelation; and cannot fail to be displeasing to our common Lord and Savior. In the spirit of the magnanimous

Paul, we should rather be predisposed "to receive him that is weak in the faith," whom we regard as in error on some fundamental points of doctrine; "but not for doubtful disputation," *μη εἰς διακρίσεις διαλογισμῶν*, not in order to contend with with him on doubtful points, Rom. 14: 1. As the object of the several evangelical denominations is one, and their common enemy one, and as their fundamental interests are one, they should study unity of counsel and concert of action, should coöperate in the promotion of objects of common interest. Whilst each denomination must naturally prefer its own peculiarities to those of any other part of Christ's kingdom, the utmost caution should be observed, not to fall into the dangerous error, either theoretically or practically, of regarding these peculiarities as equal in importance with the great fundamentals of our holy religion, held in common by all. Thus, for ourselves we openly avow that we are *Lutherans*, and prefer the doctrines, the organization and usages of the American Lutheran church to all others; yet, with the venerable Dr. Miller, late professor in the Presbyterian Theological Seminary at Princeton, we say, "It would never occur to us to place the peculiarities of our creed among the fundamentals of our common Christianity." But for any one sect to set herself up as the only true church, refusing the recognition of others as co-equal branches of the Redeemer's kingdom, is not only highly criminal in the sight of God, but is intellectually contemptible. Such are the proper character and relations of the several portions of the church of Christ, according to the principles of God's word. It cannot be denied, the ideal is a sublime one, entirely throwing into the back ground the great Protestant schism. Would that it were already fully realized!

Whilst the several denominations thus unite in holding fast the great fundamentals of our common faith, and giving them due prominence, they will learn to place less importance on the points in which they differ. They will move on harmoniously, striving together for the furtherance of the Gospel. The word of the Master will be studied more impartially; since change of opinion on non-fundamental points, will be regarded as less important. Some peculiarity of one or other church, will commend itself to the judgment of sister denominations, and be gradually and insensibly adopted by all; as is exemplified in the increasing prevalence of the Lutheran practice of Catechization, in the relaxation of the rigid aspects of absolute or unconditional election by a large portion of Calvinists, and in the abandonment of the doctrine of the real

or bodily presence of Christ in the Eucharist, (loosely named Consubstantiation,) by the vast majority of the Lutheran church both in Europe and America. Thus will the asperity of sectarian diversities be gradually abraded. The utmost possible efficiency will be given to the aggressive efforts of christians; the several portions of the one church of Christ, be insensibly brought nearer together in obedience to the "new commandment of the Master, that we love one another." As much uniformity will be attained in doctrine and practice, as is feasible amid the infirmities of our fallen nature, and the church will be developed into the full and glorious completion of the Savior's supplication: "*Holy Father—neither pray I for these alone; but for them also who shall believe on me through their word: that they may also be one, as thou Father art in me and I in thee, that they may also be one in us; that the world may believe that thou hast sent me.*" Thus concentrated, and harmonized in all its parts, continued triumphs will attend the onward march of the church, toward the grand consummated design of her mission. Not only will *the universal priesthood of christians*, the recognition of *individual rights* and the work of *individual conversions*, progress with accelerated velocity; but, by the special outpourings of the Spirit, *nations* will be born comparatively in a day. Kings will become nursing fathers and queens nursing mothers to the church. Civil rulers generally will descend from the chair of state, and do homage at the foot of the cross. The civil and political history of nations, will present a purified and christianized page. The giant evils of the world will be subdued, and, whilst glory is given to God in the highest, peace and good will will reign amongst the sons of men. Nor should occasional seasons of adversity, impair our confidence in this glorious consummation. The wheel of Providence is a large one, and cycles of ages may be consumed in its revolution. But it moves onward with a divine impetus, and the time will assuredly come, when the developed church of the Redeemer will have grown into a holy temple in the Lord, and have extended over the entire earth; the time when the kingdoms of this world will have become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ, and from the entire length and breadth of this mediatorial empire, shall arise one universal song of praise, "as the voice of a great multitude, and as the voice of many waters, and as the voice of mighty thunders, saying, *Alleluia, the Lord God omnipotent reigneth.*"

ARTICLE II.

DELITZSCH ON THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

Translated from the German by Professor Jacobs.

*Ueber Verfasser und Leser des Hebräerbriefs mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der neuesten Untersuchungen Wieseler's und Thiersch's: von F. Delitzsch.** [Concerning the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews and the persons to whom it was addressed, with particular reference to the latest investigations of Wieseler and Thiersch: by F. Delitzsch.]

THE Epistle to the Hebrews is peculiar amongst the books of the New Testament, just as the prophetic cycle, Isaiah 40—66, like to it in spirit, stands alone amongst the books of the Old Testament. In both books, the subject matter, which is divided into three principal parts, possesses the same surpassing importance; and the language the same majestic step and bearing. In both books are felt the breathings of the atmosphere of a future world; and over the origin of both hangs the veil of a deep mystery. No other book of the New Testament possesses such rhetorical splendor, such rythmical melody, as the Epistle to the Hebrews. Its particular form, however, is not one *adapted to* the subject, it is an *emanation from* the subject itself. The Epistle is so melodious to the ear, because the superior glory of the new covenant to that of the old constitutes its substance. The Old and New Testaments are contrasted with each other, and the moonlight of the Old grows pale before the bright sunrise of the New. The style is more oratorical than argumentative; it is not so bold and spirited as that of the Epistle to the Galatians; not so resistless and overwhelming as in that to the Ephesians; its progress is marked by a deeper consciousness of composure, by a more exalted solemnity, and by a more silent majesty.

Before us we behold a treatise, but the special objects of the exhortation, with which the doctrinal part is interwoven, show us at once, that it is a sermon, which the author is delivering to a particular church; and, at the conclusion, the sermon, or as the author himself styles his composition, the λόγος παρακλή-

* Mittheilung aus des Verf. akademischen Vorlesungen über den Hebräerbrief im Winterhalbjahr 1848-9, published in Rudelbach and Guericke's Zeitschr. Zehnter Jahrgang, 1849. Zweites Quartalheft.

σας word of exhortation, transforms itself into an epistle. In most manuscripts, and even in the Peshito or old Syriac version, this is placed between the thirteenth Epistle of Paul and the so-called Catholic Epistles. It is not placed among the Pauline, and yet it is not reckoned as belonging to the seven Catholic Epistles. The doubtful position thus assigned it, is already an evidence how uncertain are its origin and aim. Although it bears not the name of an apostle, its contents, nevertheless, have no remote connection with the apostolic writings. The whole Epistle, when compared with the writings of the apostolical fathers, is undoubtedly calculated to produce the impression, that it has emanated from the original creative power of an apostolic mind. And if it has come from an apostle, from whom else could it be, but from Paul? But, except near the close, the Epistle by no means produces the impression that he was its writer. Its form is not Pauline, and its thoughts, though in no part unlike those of Paul, yet rise in many respects, above his style of teaching, elsewhere presented to our inspection. Only towards its close, where it assumes the form of an epistle, are we impressed with the idea that we hear Paul and no one else.

But the same veil which hangs over the author of the Epistle, also hangs over the persons to whom it is addressed.—They constitute a church or churches of peculiar character and experience. But where are they to be found? They have been sought for first in Palestine, then in Syria, in Cilicia and other countries in Asia Minor, and in Egypt. But no satisfactory result concerning either writer or readers has as yet been obtained. Even the direct Pauline authorship is yet here and there defended. We might denominate the author of this Epistle the "great unknown" of the New Testament, as Ewald denominated the author of Isaiah 40—66, the great unknown of the Old Testament. His Epistle bears a resemblance to the Melchisedec of sacred History, of whom the seventh chapter speaks. With a royal priestly solemnity the Epistle moves along, and as Melchisedec had neither beginning nor end, so also this Epistle is ἀγενεαλόγητος, we know not whence it comes or whither it goes.

And yet the question, who are the readers of this epistle, is one of great importance to its proper comprehension. But of still far greater practical importance is the question concerning its author; not, indeed, if the view of Hoffman be right, (*Weissagung und Erfüllung*, I. § 6.), that the canonical authority of a book of the Bible does not depend upon our knowledge of its author, whether he had moreover any special call

in the history of redemption, and therefore whether he was properly inspired. If the canonical authority is not dependent upon the historical testimony of the church, but solely upon the testimony of the Spirit, which assures the community of Christ, that in the Scriptures it has always the same rule of faith (confession) and that fulness of all truth and knowledge which it needs in order to preserve its living communion with its Head, then may the Epistle to the Hebrews be canonical, no matter who is its author. But this testimony of the Spirit, which dwells in the church, has reference to the Scriptures as an organic whole, and not to single disputed books, which, without destroying Scripture as a body might be regarded as not belonging to it. It tells the church, that the divine work of redemption, as unfolded in the Scriptures in its historical and doctrinal contents, is objective and absolute truth; the Spirit produces an internal conviction thereof in the church, and seals it with his yea and amen. But whether, for example, the Epistle of James is canonical or not, the Holy Spirit does not decide by giving direct testimony to the church. If that were the case, Luther would have sinned against the Holy Ghost, when he refused to receive the Epistle of James into the number of canonical books; learned investigation would be cut off in advance, because that testimony would have to be acknowledged as a fact before which we must bow, and we would not dare to arrive at such a result as, that there exists a contradiction between the doctrine of justification of James and that of Paul, since what is canonical cannot contradict itself. Whence, therefore, does the church derive the conviction that a book is canonical? Whence does ecclesiastical science derive it, to which belongs the office of showing, by means of a critical, historical and biblical theological examination, the source and the propriety of that conviction, or of destroying it as occasion may be found? It must be made clear to the church and to science that the author of this book belongs to the number of those, whose office it was to found churches, and to whom belonged the authority and qualifications necessary for this purpose; for only on this supposition could what he said be regarded as canonical, or as constituting a rule or basis for the faith, life and edification of the church. But this calling, and the necessary qualifications and endowments the apostles actually possessed; and, therefore, the canonical authority of a book of the New Testament depends upon its apostolic origin, testified to by the primitive church, confirmed by the testimony of the Spirit, both in general and in particular, in the church of all ages. But yet historical

tradition is by no means free from doubt and controversy concerning all the books of the Bible. The bounds of the canon are consequently not fixed as far as both church and theological science are concerned. The canonical authority of several books yet remains, or at least until now has been, an open question.

We agree, therefore, with Schleiermacher, Twisten, and Nitzsch, amongst the moderns, who regard the canonical authority of a book of the New Testament as depending upon the peculiar relation, which its author sustained towards Jesus; and upon the nature of his sacred calling for the church. Sack, in his interesting tract on the Word of God, also starts out with this principle, in the opinion which he expresses concerning the Epistle to the Hebrews. Bleek expresses the same opinion in his commentary, although he distinguishes too much between the churchly and the scientific as of separate interests. This is the principle which has guided the opinion of the most ancient churches and of the church of the German Reformation. The latter makes the canonical authority of a book of the New Testament dependant upon the agreement of the internal evidence (*criteria interna*), with the testimony of the primitive church (*testificatio primitivae ecclesiae*). In addition to these, the newer Dogmatic demands historical testimony, although it is disposed to give it an inferior place in comparison with the *criteria interna*. In Luther's N. T. as late as 1546-8, the Epistles to the Hebrews, of James and of Judas, and the Apocalypse were placed at the end, as not belonging to the well ascertained canonical books of the New Testament. This explains the reason of the position which they, at present, occupy in the German Bible. Conrad Deitrich (1613) and other writers on dogmatics, class the Epistle to the Hebrews among the Apocryphal Books of the N. T. (*libri apocryphi*) [a very unbecoming expression,] as Carlstadt, in his treatise concerning the canonical scriptures (*de canonicis scripturis*) of A. D. 1520, had placed it among those known as belonging to the third and last book of the N. T. (*novi t. codicis tertiæ et ultimæ celebratis*). Even Nichol. Hunnius, in his popular epitome of articles of faith, (*epitome credendorum*) republished by Brandt, retains the distinction between the *homologoumena* or generally received, and *antilegoumena* or disputed books of the N. T. Our symbols are adapted to this free historical arrangement of the canon. They do not fix the bounds of the canon, because in reality they are not capable of being clearly ascertained. On the contrary the church of Rome, at the council of Trent, laid

down as a church doctrine that Paul had written fourteen Epistles. The Reformed church teaches the same in some of its symbols, viz: the Belgic, the Helvetic of 1566 and the Bohemian Confessions, whilst the Gallic reckons only thirteen Pauline epistles. Much depends upon the fact, that, in such things, the church does not bind itself and ecclesiastical science by a positive rule. The testimony of the Spirit furnishes us with the historical foundation, which is essential to the confirmation of objective truth; but a book is canonical when the testimony of the Spirit agrees with that of history. It is necessary, therefore, to enable us to recognize our epistle as canonical to have the historical testimony of its direct, or at furthest its indirect apostolical origin.

Before we hear the testimony of the ancient church, we must, then, interrogate the epistle concerning the testimony which it bears of itself. The only safe conclusion we can derive from it is, that it was written before A. D. 70; for according to chapter 9: 6-10 the temple was yet standing, and offerings were yet made whilst the author wrote. We also agree with Wieseler, that the epistle justifies the certain conclusion that it was composed before the beginning of the Jewish war, A. D. 66; for it would have been impossible, had that time of judgment and tribulation already arrived, of which Jesus himself, in the near approach of his death, had a clear view and of which he spoke to his disciples, that mention should not have been made of it in this epistle. This indirect testimony of the epistle concerning its author is confirmed by the fact, that Clement of Rome, in his undoubtedly genuine Epistle to the Corinthians (*πρὸς Κορινθίους ἐπιστολή*), which was written shortly after the persecution of Nero, and perhaps even before the destruction of Jerusalem (which Hasele, quite recently, has attempted to establish in Wetzers and Weltes Kirchen Lexicon, 1848), appropriated to himself whole passages of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and, therefore, that the latter was already in existence is presupposed. When Jerome speaks of a great similarity (*grandis similitudo*) between both epistles, he, without doubt, has these borrowed passages in his eye. But if we look at the relation of these epistles in other respects, there is much more reason to speak of a great dissimilarity (*grandis dissimilitudo*) between them.

There is an immense difference between the richness, solidity and depth of the epistle to the Hebrews, and the poverty, the sermonizing amplification, and the minute prolixity of that to the Corinthians. Schelling is right, when in his lectures on the philosophy of revelation (published by Paulus, p. 714,)

he says, that we may see, in Clement, and especially in the apostolic fathers, how, after the time of the great religious excitement resulting from the introduction of christianity, there followed the deepest depression. A few verses of the epistle to the Hebrews outweigh all the 59 chapters of that of Clement. The latter, therefore, not only confirms the opinion, that the epistle to the Hebrews was composed before A. D. 70; but also gives an appearance of probability to its apostolic, and even to its Pauline origin, inasmuch as it thus appears to be intimately allied to the Pauline books of the New Testament, to the epistles of Paul, and to the Pauline Gospel of Luke (a conclusion which Zeller has indeed attempted to disprove, *Jahrb.* 1848, 4, p. 530.) The conclusion, however, seems to be confirmed, if we attend further to the epistle itself, by the circumstance of the author standing, according to 13: 23, in a relation to Timothy, which was occupied by none but Paul; and also by the fact that he was in Italy, as appears from 13: 24, which concludes with a salutation only from the saints in Italy; and perhaps still further from 13: 19, from which passage and its context it is clear that the author was then in a state of confinement. This is, however, again rendered doubtful by the positive ὁλομαι ὑμᾶς "I will see you," 13: 23, for which we would have expected to see ἐλπίζω ἰδεῖν ὑμᾶς, still not so much so as to justify us, with Wieseler, as quoted above,¹ to conclude confidently that the author, according to this passage, was at full liberty. We cannot obtain an entirely reliable idea of the situation of the author, from the conclusion of the epistle. But so much is clear, that he had determined to visit, in person, the church to which he was writing, and that too in company with Timothy, who had been at liberty, if he should arrive in time; still it is yet possible that the author himself, at the time of writing, was in confinement, but hoped to be immediately discharged. We may take the conclusion as we will, it still points us to Paul, and we appear to have before us one of his letters written in prison, such as that to the Ephesians, in the writing of which he had not Timothy with him. But the impression produced by the conclusion contradicts that to which we are led by the passage 2: 3. According to the latter, the author appears, not indeed as Twisten supposes (*Dog.* I. p. 96). to belong to a later generation, but to class himself with those who had received the Gospel, not directly, but indirectly, from the Lord. Scarcely could an apostle

¹Chronologie des apostolischen Zeitalters 1848. Anh: der Brief an die Hebraer.

write thus, and least of all Paul, who at other times so strongly asserted that he had received his gospel not from man, but immediately from the Lord. The figure of speech (*communicatio*) [by which the writer makes himself a partner with his readers, and says *we* instead of *you*,] which has been adduced in favor of this view, is of no avail here. The words (*ἡμεῖς ἀκούσαντων εἰς ἡμᾶς εβελωθη*) "confirmed to us by them that heard" (2: 3) do not suit Paul, but rather a disciple of the apostle. Apollos could have written thus; or, as he received the gospel at third hand, from Aquila, the language would have suited Clement of Rome (probably he that is alluded to Phil. 4: 3), of whom Irenæus, quoted by Eusebius *h. e. iv. 6*, relates "that he could yet see the apostle preach, and hear the sounds of his voice." Barnabas could also have thus written, for Tertullian's assertion *hic ab apostolis didicit (de pudicitia c. 20)* that he learned of the apostles, is at least as worthy of belief, as that of Clement, that Barnabas was one of the seventy disciples. But most assuredly Luke could have written thus, for in his gospel 1: 2, he expresses himself substantially in the same manner as the author of Heb. 2: 3.

We turn now from the testimony which the epistle itself affords, to that of the primitive church. As the epistle itself leads us to suppose one while that it is, and again that it is not Pauline, so the Eastern church declared it is, and the Western church it is not Pauline. Such was the state of the case until the time of Jerome and Augustine. With these first, the testimony of the Eastern church and church writers prevailed over the doubts of the Western. From the councils of Hippo and Carthage (393 and 397) the epistle in virtue of its now acknowledged Pauline origin, retained an unvaried position among the (*canonicæ scripturæ*) canonical scriptures, as one of (*quatuor decim epistolæ Pauli*) the fourteen epistles of Paul. The testimony of the primitive churches has naturally a historical value only down to this time. In order to appreciate and present this testimony correctly, it is necessary to make a liberal allowance for things to be taken for granted, for no portion of the history of literature has been obscured more by the infusion of a false subjective interest, than the expressed opinions of the primitive church concerning the books of the New Testament. This may be clearly seen with regard to the epistle to the Hebrews. The conviction of the oriental church of its Pauline origin, is much stronger and deeper, than would appear from the representations of Bleek, who unconsciously suffered himself to be misled, by his own conviction of its non-Pauline origin, to depreciate the former as much as

possible. The opinion of Tertullian, that the epistle was written by Barnabas, is supposed by Thiersch (*de epist. ad Hebræos*, Marburgi 1848) to be traceable to the tradition of the Monastic churches of Asia, whilst his own view of the matter is, that the epistle is the joint work of Paul and Barnabas, and that they allude to themselves when they speak of the spies, whom "Rahab the harlot," (a type of the Jewish church converted to the faith in Christ,) received in faith. And Wieseler derives, from a passage of Jerome, which directly states the contrary, a far-fetched proof that the view which regarded Barnabas as the author, was spread abroad also throughout the East. He views this passage in a false light, because he considers the Epistle to the Hebrews to have been addressed to Jewish Christians in Egypt.

We may safely review the facts upon which are based the testimony and opinions of the primitive church concerning this Epistle, for all the sources of information relating to it are yet accessible, of which Jerome gives a notice in C. 5. of his (*catalogus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum*) list of ecclesiastical writers.

1) Let us review the testimony of the Eastern churches, and the opinions of individuals so far as they are known upon this point.

Throughout the whole East our epistle passes as the work of Paul, and therefore as confessedly canonical; even those ecclesiastical writers, in whom the unapostolic form excites a doubt, adhere at least to the indirect authorship of Paul; only heretics, Marcion and the Arians, entirely reject it as not being Pauline. Jerome, who had the most extensive acquaintance with the literature of the primitive church, testifies in his epistle *ad Dardanum*, that this epistle, which is inscribed to the Hebrews, is acknowledged as Paul's the apostle, not only by the Eastern churches, but, on the contrary, by all the Greek ecclesiastical writers, although most ascribe it either to Barnabas or to Clement.¹ Wieseler (p. 508, ff) interprets these as meaning, that the Epistle to the Hebrews was received in the East as coming from Paul, although, at the same time, the most of those who did so, supposed that it had received its present form from Barnabas or Clement. This explanation rests, however, alone on a self-deception of the worthy investigator, by whom we would otherwise be glad to be instructed.

¹ *Illud nostris dicendum est, hanc epistolam quæ inscribitur ad Hebræos, non solum ab ecclesiis orientis, sed ab omnibus retro ecclesiasticis græci sermonis scriptoribus quasi Pauli apostoli suscipi, licet plerique eam vel Barnabæ vel Clementis arbitrentur.*

For since in the East not so much as a single voice is heard, which directly ascribes our epistle to Clement, and since Barnabas is not even named in connection with it, the words *quasi apostoli Pauli* manifestly mean that it is *Pauline*, and the ambiguous *plerique* are, as Tholuck and others have correctly inferred, *most* of the Latins, of whom Jerome immediately afterwards says: "The Latins are not accustomed to receive it among the canonical scriptures."¹

Jerome's unrestricted assertion concerning the opinion of the East is in all respects correct. a) Origen, in his evidences concerning the New Testament canon, which Eusebius has collected *h. e.* 6: 25, says that the (*νοήματα*) *mind* of the epistle is Pauline, but the form of language is more hellenic than it could be if of Paul, who calls himself (2 Cor. 11: 6, *ἰδιώτης τοῦ λόγου*) *rude in speech*. Who the amenuensis (*ὁ γράφων*) was, whether a disciple of Paul or not, no man knows. If a church holds the epistle as undoubtedly Pauline (*ὡς Παύλου* = *quasi Pauli*), we are not to find fault with it; for not without sufficient reason have holy men handed it down as of Paul.²—The fundamental idea of Origen is plain. "According to tradition the epistle comes from Paul, either directly or indirectly, and in either case it is Pauline." b) Eusebius, writing on the canon, III, 25, does not class our epistle amongst the disputed books (*Antilegoumena*), and also in III, 3, he says: "*but the fourteen (Epistles) of Paul are clearly and generally known.*"³ At the same time he remarks, that some do not include the Epistle to the Hebrews, whilst the Romish church does not even acknowledge it as Pauline. c) The Syriac church also acknowledged it as apostolical. Wieseler has, indeed, (pp. 229 and 510) come to the conclusion that the Syriac church did *not* ascribe it to Paul, because in the Peschito version it is placed after the pastoral letters and that to Philemon; but this position, as the fourteenth of the Epistles of Paul, was also at first given it by the Greek church, (Bleek *Einleitung*, §. 45,) and it was natural, because the epistle was anonymous. If we were to conclude, from its position in the Peschito version, that the ancient Syriac church did not esteem it as Pauline, we would yet expect to hear from her some whisperings of doubt, but on the contrary, James of Nisibis, Efreim and others, acknowledge themselves as adherents to the Pauline origin of the epistle; Theodoret defends it against the Arians; and the

¹ *Eam Latinorum consuetudo non recipit inter scripturas canonicas.*

² οὐ γὰρ εἰπὴ οἱ ἀρχαῖοι ἄνθρωποι ὡς Παύλου αὐτὴν παραδεδώκασι.

³ τοῦ δὲ Παύλου πρόβητοι καὶ σαφεῖς αἱ δεκατεσσαρεῖς.

stichometry of Nicephorus, which, according to Credner's investigation (9. Jahrg.) was derived from a Syriac source, reckons 14 Pauline Epistles. Accordingly it is regarded throughout the whole East as the production of the apostle, and therefore as undisputed. The doubts, wherever expressed, are sought to be removed by means of various auxiliary suppositions, such as, that the epistle was penned by a disciple of the apostle, or, that it was translated from the Hebrew. Wheresoever, in the East, there existed a doubt of its Pauline origin, although we have not a single direct evidence of such doubt, it most probably resulted from an influence extending itself over from the West.

2) For, the West presents to us precisely the opposite of the East. This must not be ascribed to a too late appearance of the epistle in the West, on account of which it might not be regarded as ancient and genuine, as Thiersch assumes,¹ for Clement of Rome is already in possession of the epistle. As far back, however, as we can follow the literature of the West, it does not appear to have been regarded as Pauline. *a)* The oldest evidence we find, lies in the *fragmentum de canone*, which Muratori has published in his Italian antiquities (*antiquitates Italicae* 1740,) from a now lost manuscript of Ambrosiana. This has been clumsily translated from the Greek.—Thiersch has expressed the suspicion in his *Versuch*, that it is perhaps a mystification of Muratori; but Wieseler² and Credner³ have placed beyond doubt, not only its genuineness, but also its composition towards the second century. This fragment acknowledges only thirteen Pauline Epistles, and mentions, besides, two circulated under the name of Paul, one (*ad Laodicenses*) the yet existing apocryphal epistle to the Laodiceans, and one (*ad Alexandrinos*) to the Alexandrians, with the title: "Composed in the name of Paul against the heretical sect of Marcion."⁴ Wieseler, in his *Studien* and his *Chronology*, maintains, in opposition to Bleek, that this Epistle to the Alexandrians is that inscribed to the Hebrews; Guericke also inclines to this opinion (Einleitung p. 50 &c).—But Credner, in the work mentioned p. 88, &c, justly denies this opinion any foundation or plausibility. It is also not easy to determine whether *ad* means for or against.⁵ In favor of the former meaning is the fact, that the Manichaeans quoted

¹ Versuch zur Herstellung u. s. u. p. 352—compare p. 314.

² Studien 1847, 4.

³ Zur Geschichte des Kanon 1847.

⁴ Pauli nomine facta ad Marcionis haeresin.

⁵ προς την Μαρκίωνος αίρεσιν.

the Epistle in their favor, but against it, that Marcion rejected it. In either case, the *fragment* gives evidence that so early as about A. D. 170, the Epistle to the Hebrews was not acknowledged as canonical in the West. b) Caius¹ acknowledged only thirteen Epistles of Paul, and asserted this to be the case, as we learn from Photius, in his controversy with Proclus (*disputatio contra Proclum*.) His unwillingness to acknowledge more can easily be explained. As he was led to the rejection of the Apocalypse through his opposition to the millenarianism of the Montanists, he was led to the rejection of the Epistle to the Hebrews through his opposition to their perpetual exclusion of those who had apostatized from christianity (*lapsi*).² As this aversion to the Epistle was necessarily increased by the Novatian controversy, it is not to be wondered at that Cyprian, who opposed the Novatians, should have acknowledged only Paul's Epistles addressed (*ad septem ecclesias*) to the seven churches. Philastrius (†387) declares directly (*haeres*. 89) that the Epistle was not regarded as Pauline, and was only here and there read publicly: 1) because of its form: it being written in rhetorical and high-sounding language,³ which is not characteristic of Paul: 2) because that 3: 2, savors of Arianism: and 3) because that 6: 6 savors of Novatianism. The assertion of Credner, Anger and Wieseler, p. 481, that some regarded the Epistle to the Hebrews as (*conscripita ad Laodicenses*) written to the Laodiceans, cannot be here substantiated. Philastrius speaks of two Epistles, and says, that that to the Laodiceans was not at all, and that to the Hebrews only occasionally read in public.

c) It is a matter of great surprise how, beside these witnesses, who contented themselves with merely denying the apostolic authorship of the Epistle, Tertullian,⁴ without any further reason, should designate it as the production of Barnabas. That he does not at all allude to the opinions of the East, although he adduces the Epistle as a warrant for the montanistic view which he held against the restoration of those who had fallen away, is evidence how deep was the opposition of the West. Tertullian, however, is alone in Latin literature in the opinion of the authorship belonging to Barnabas. Jerome, it is true, in the passage above referred to, says: "*Although most ascribe it either to Barnabas or to Clement;*" but, in his (*cat. scriptorum eccles.*) catalogue of ecclesiastical writers, he is able

¹Eusebius VI. 20.²Hebrews 6: 6.³*Rhetorice at sermone plausibili.*⁴*De pudicitia* c. 20, exstat et Barnabae titulus ad Hebraeos.

to name Tertullian only in favor of the former opinion.¹ It is therefore possible, that Tertullian only expressed, with a confident freedom, his own supposition; although Barnabas may have been fallen upon also in larger circles. But since the name of Barnabas is not once named in the East in connection with the Epistle to the Hebrews, we cannot see how Wieseler (p. 507) can assert, that among the oldest church evidences the tradition, that Barnabas was the author of this epistle, alone remains untouched. On the contrary, if we take an unprejudiced historical view of the state of the case, the tradition of the East in favor of its Pauline origin remains untouched; for the aversion of the West, to which the fact that the epistle was anonymous was a welcome circumstance, receives its explanation in subjective interests. As the montanist Tertullian denominated the pastor of Hermas the pastor of debauchees (*moechorum*), because he acknowledged that there was room for repentance to those, who after baptism had apostatized, so also must the anti-montanistic church regard the Epistle to the Hebrews, which seemed to deny repentance after baptism, as gall which dare not be mixed with honey.

Having heard the witnesses of the church, we will endeavor to come into the clear in reference to the author of the epistle, so far as can be done by a consideration of internal criteria, without entering exegetically into its contents.

That the Epistle was written immediately by Paul, is scarcely possible; that it was, on the contrary, derived from him indirectly, is not only not impossible, but also more probable than that it originated from any one else directly. To prove this will be the aim of the following remarks.

1. The direct authorship of Paul is scarcely possible. A reason, of itself sufficient to prove this, is in advance to be found in the great difference observable between the style and the mode of presenting truth in this Epistle, and in those of Paul. This difference does not lie pre-eminently in new expressions which we do not elsewhere find common with him, such as, that Christ is called (*ἀπόστολος*) apostle and (*ἀρχιερεύς*) High Priest, and that so much is said of him as the *perfect* and the *perfecter* in relation to the law which was incapable of producing perfection; for if it can be shown, that these are only new modes of expressing new trains of thought flowing from Pauline premises, it might easily be assumed, that as the apostle appears, from his other Epistles, to have been continually sinking himself deeper into the great object of salvation,

¹ Sed vel Barnabæ, juxta Tertullianum.

and to have been engaged in its constant pursuit as a subject, not only experiencing, but also intelligently understanding its inestimable value, he here only adopted or invented new expressions for the new ideas that arose in his mind. Besides, in addition to these new expressions, there is quite a number of such as are appropriately Pauline, as (κηροφορία) *full assurance*, (ὁ λόγος τῆς ἀκοῆς) *the word of instruction*, the ambiguous use of (διαθήκη) *testament, covenant, dispensation*, so that the characteristic Pauline expressions counterbalance the new.

Nor is the difference above mentioned, to be sought in the rhetorical character of the Epistle, for we may regard the Epistles to the Col., Phil., and Eph., written in confinement, which at the same time want the dialectic form, as a transition to this new mode of treating the epistolary material; and if the genuineness of the pastoral epistle is capable of proof, we derive from them evidence that the style of the apostle varies under the different circumstances in which he was placed, and we need not wonder at the difference between the style of his other Epistles and this, which assumes the epistolary form only towards its close, and until then might be viewed as an example of oral apostolical instruction. That diversity, which is scarcely reconcilable with an immediate Pauline authorship, consists in this, that the epistle is entirely free from the rudeness of speech of the apostle,¹ as Origen expresses it, from that, to a great extent, ineffectual effort to confine within the channel of speech the streaming fullness of thought which, in Paul's writings, causes so many disconnected, parenthetical and overburdened dragging sentences. How greatly our epistle contrasts, in this respect, with the manner of Paul. To this epistle belong the finest and most delicate colorings of speech, a solemn rhetorical rhythm, and a skillful expression of thought which does not indeed always equally well succeed, but which yet always exhibits beautiful arrangement of language, and of truly classical sentences. This is the reason that the forms of introducing scriptural citations, and the Divine appellations in this epistle are different from what is usual with Paul, and that many of his favorite expressions and turns of thought, which we might here expect, are entirely wanting. From this we conclude that the particular form of the epistle, as far as there is in such things any critical certainty, excludes the idea of its immediate Pauline origin.

2. But its mediate origin from him is not impossible. By common consent it has as a whole a more intimate relation to

¹ τὰ ἐν λόγῳ ἰδιωτικὸν τοῦ ἀποστόλου

the Epistles of Paul than to all other writings of the New Testament. The progress of christian doctrine in the Epistle to the Hebrews, is evidently, in many particulars, carried out on the principle and in the spirit of Paul. If we take, for example, the word concerning the exaltation of Christ "above all heavens," (Eph. 4: 10) and that concerning his heavenly intercession for believers (Rom. 8: 34), we have the germs out of which might grow the doctrine of our epistle concerning the high priesthood of Christ in the holy of holies in heaven. In the view which Paul took of the Old Testament ceremonial law as weak and imperfect,¹ all is already included which is said in the Epistle to the Hebrews of the inability of the law to produce perfection and of Christ as the offering and High Priest by whom this object is to be attained. These are only examples. The way, then, in which our epistle treats the Old Testament is no other than a further extension of Paul's figurative method of explaining the subject in hand, as seen in Gal. 4: 21-31, Rom. 5: 14, 1 Cor. 10: 1-6. Yet we cannot deny, that it is very surprising, not any where here to meet with certain ideas, which in a measure exercise a controlling influence upon his mode of looking at things. The apostle, who through the law is dead unto the law, lives in the opposition of the righteousness of faith and of works; he, whom the Lord called as apostle, not in the days of his flesh, but from his exalted life in heavenly glory, lives and moves in the resurrection of Jesus Christ; he, whose call was directed to the heathen world, and who was appointed to effect a separation between the synagogue and church, devotes his life to the calling of the heathen to the fellowship of the Gospel. Of these three fundamental doctrines of the apostle, we find (13: 20) only an accidental reference to that of the resurrection. This remarkable silence can, indeed, to some extent, be explained. The apostle, we might say, speaks not of justification only by faith, for it was necessary to warn the Hebrews, not against the righteousness of works, but against apostacy. It was not, therefore, a matter of importance to present the contrariety of faith and of works, but the connection between faith and the promise and the riches it contains, in order to strengthen the exhortation to steadfastness of faith; further, he speaks not of the resurrection, because, passing over the intermediate events, he contrasts at once the self-humiliation of Christ with his highest exaltation, and directs attention to his active interest in our behalf in that

¹ στοιχεῖα τοῦ νομοῦ. Gal. 4.

exalted state; and lastly, he is silent concerning the calling of the Gentiles, because he writes to a church of purely Jewish christians. But this explanation is not at all satisfactory, since where the same range of thought occurs also in the affiliated Epistles to the Colossians, Philippians and Ephesians, they do not so strongly deny the stamp of Paul's mind. In order to understand this, it is necessary that we should ascertain more exactly the degree of indirectness there may have been in the origination of the epistle. For that single reason, it is impossible that it could be a translation, without regard to its flowing language, its play upon words only possible in Greek, its quotations from the Old Testament, made according to the LXX, even with its errors, and its comparative freedom from Hebraisms. If the Epistle had been presented to any one in the Hebrew language, as Clement of Alexandria assumes, the great points of Paul's type of doctrine would have more prominently appeared. We are under the necessity of assuming, that Paul communicated the fundamental thoughts of the epistle to one of his pupils and companions, and that he arranged and prepared the matter independently, yet in such a manner that the apostle could approve and acknowledge the work.

3. To this hypothesis, advocated by Origen, and for which we shall hereafter adduce positive reasons, we give our assent, because such an indirect production of the Epistle through Paul, is relatively far more probable than its origin through any one else. The most improbable view is, that it was written to the Alexandrians by Apollos, whom, as a disciple of John, Aquila and Priscilla, converts of Paul, instructed more fully in the doctrines of christianity, and who labored with success at Ephesus and Corinth, being, according to Acts 18: 24-28 "an eloquent man, and mighty in the scriptures." Luther first fixed on him as author. In a discourse on the Epistles, at Christmas, he says: "This is a strong, powerful and sublime epistle, which moves onward with majesty, and treats of the sublime article of faith concerning the divinity of Christ, and it is a fancy worthy of belief, that it was not written by Paul since it possesses a more ornate style than is usual with Paul." Some suppose that Luke was its author, and others Apollos, whom Luke praises as one mighty in the scriptures in his disputations with the Jews." According to this passage, compared with the remark, (on Gen. 48: 20,) *and if, as I suppose, Apollos,*¹ Luther seems to have derived this view from orally

¹Sive, ut ego arbitror, Apollo.

expressed opinions of some one of his cotemporaries; or it first through him became the common property of the many, for no writer before his time, is known, who has recorded such a view.¹ The chief ground upon which the hasty opinion expressed by Luther, that the authorship belonged to Apollos the Alexandrian, is further sought to be supported,² is the intimate connection of the Epistle with the modes of viewing, interpretation and expression peculiar to the Alexandrian Jews.—There are certainly various and numerous parallels to our Epistle, to be found in these peculiarities, as may be seen in the writings of Philo, their chief representative; for example, to the description of the Divine Logos; to the assumption of an original heavenly world which is our real fatherland, and of an original heavenly sanctuary; to the doctrine of the true and the all-comprehending high priesthood; to the reference of the Old Testament ceremonial law to Christ; to the allegorical interpretation, and particularly also the drawing of conclusions from the supposed significant silence of the scriptures in reference to principles; to the exegetical phrases of the Epistle;³ and also to many of its peculiar figures and expressions. Philo, for example, calls the first principles of christian doctrine milk nourishment,⁴ and so does our Epistle, 5:12, and the designation of Jesus as “the High Priest of our profession,”⁵ is word for word the same as the designation by Philo, of the Logos.⁶ On this point we may compare *the sacred exercises on the Epistle of Paul to the Hebrews by Philo of Alexandria* of Jo. Bened. Carpozov (grandson of the orthodox Theologian of the same name), and a dissertation of Superint. Grossman, *concerning some traces of the sacred Jewish Philosophy found in the Epistle to the Hebrews.*⁷ In these slight notices we have, however, not overlooked the two great differences, viz: that the Judaism of Alexandria knows nothing of the historical person of Jesus Christ, and as the light in which it views human nature is entirely Pelagian, it embraces the mediatorship of the Logos as a metaphysical divinely ordered re-

¹ Bleek I. p. 249.

² Clericus and more recently Bleek, Tholuck, Credner and others.

³ ὡς ἐρμηνεύεται, τοῦτ' ἐστὶ, &c. ⁴ γημία καὶ γαλακτώδης τροφή.

⁵ ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς τῆς ὁμολογίας ἡμῶν. ⁶ 653, 14. 654, 6.

⁷ Sacre exercitationes in St. Pauli Epistolam ad Hebræos ex Philone Alex. Helmstädt, 1750, 8.

⁸ de philosophiæ Judæorum sacræ vestigiis nonnullis in Ep. ad Heb. concipuis, 1833-4.

lation, and not as an actual fact pre-arranged in revelation and consummated in history. But notwithstanding this important difference, those points of contact in conception, method and expression, are so numerous and striking, that it is impossible that they should be accidental. If we, therefore, assume Apollos, the Jewish christian of Alexandria, to be author of this Epistle, these things explain themselves. And yet neither Carpzov nor Grossman is of this opinion. Carpzov adheres to the tradition of the Eastern church, and explains the Alexandrian stamp referred to, by the fact that Paul came from Tarsus, next to Alexandria the most cultivated city of the East in Greek literature and philosophy, and by the intercourse between it and the Hellenic Jews dispersed abroad, particularly the Alexandrian Jews at Rome, for since the victory of Julius Caesar in the Alexandrian war, captive Jews were transferred to Rome, and Strabo states that Rome was filled with Tarsenians and Alexandrians. But Grossman, who very properly maintains that there existed an intimate connection between the Alexandrian doctrines and tradition and those of Palestine, considers it improbable that the author of the Epistle was educated at Alexandria, notwithstanding the stamp of this city, which it seems to bear, *for the things which are reported as selected from the tradition of the fathers, agree with Josephus and others of Palestine, but differ from Philo and the Alexandrians.*¹ In reference to what the author states of the giving of the law through the instrumentality of angels, of Moses' contempt of the royal name, and of the relation of the Passover to the passing by of the destroying angel, and in reference to several other things, parallels are to be found with Josephus, but not with Philo, with whom, rather, things are to be found which are contradictory. There is yet another thing through which the authorship of Apollos loses its support.—Not only the Epistle to the Hebrews, but also the acknowledged Epistles of Paul have a close connection with Alexandrianism, as it is to be seen in Philo. He calls the Logos not merely *High priest* with the predicate *beginning of the order of life*,² and a *non partaker of sin*,³ but he also calls him "*head of the united body*,"⁴ like Paul in the Epistles to the Corinthians and Ephesians, Philo intending by *ὅμα* the natural Kosmos (the universe,) and Paul the church. And not

¹ Quae enim ex traditione majorum delibata afferuntur, ea cum Josepho et Palæstinensibus conspirant a Philone et Alexandrinis discrepant.

² ἀρχιεὺς. ³ ταξιδάρχης τῆς φύσεως. ⁴ ἀμαρτημάτων ἀμέτοχος.

⁵ ὡσανεὶ σώματος ἡνωμένου κεφαλῇ, 640, 20.

only Paul, but John also, and in general the N. T. presents numerous instances of a similar kind. We dare not deny this phenomenon, we must seek to understand it. As the Septuagint translation became to the Gentiles the herald of salvation proceeding forth from Israel, so Alexandrianism became the harbinger of the transition of the religion of the Old Testament revelation to that of the whole world. Alexandrianism originated with the effort to extract the kernel of the religion of the Old Testament revelation from its covering of the letter,—of national and of particular history, and to show that this kernel is the union of all that is true among all nations; that it is objective and universal truth, and that it is the highest philosophy. Alexandrianism, indeed, itself became somewhat cosmopolitan, in that it attempted to show the adaptedness of the Old Testament revelation to the world, since it gave too easy a reception to the Grecian, but especially to the Pythagorean Platonic philosophy. That this effort should meet with entire success was impossible, for the true emancipation of the Old Testament religion was not to be expected from a dogmatic speculative development of doctrines by man, but, since revelation had placed itself within the pale of nationality, by a new act of revelation overleaping these bounds, and consisting in this, that the salvation of the world has proceeded forth from Israel, and that this author and messenger of salvation, having become man in Israel, was, as well before as after his historical existence, a person of absolute importance, and bearing a universal relationship, not merely to Israel, but to the whole family of man. But although the effort of Alexandrianism must fall far short of its high aim, it nevertheless, in part, prepared the forms which christianity could appropriate to itself, in order by them to express the gospel, and confirm it by reference to the Old Testament scriptures, before the consummation of that fact in the history of redemption embracing all mankind—before the mystery of the actual incarnation of the Logos. If, therefore, the N. T., and in particular Paul and John stand in such a relation to Alexandrianism, the Alexandrian aspect which this Epistle bears, does not necessarily point us to Apollos as its author. We shall be the less disposed to regard him in this light, when we bear in mind that the oldest Alexandrian teachers, Patänus, Clement and Origen declared the Epistle to be the work of Paul, and not a voice is to be heard in the Eastern or Western churches of antiquity in favor of Apollos.

On the contrary, Tertullian maintains that Barnabas is the author of this Epistle, basing his opinion, as Thiersch suppo-

ses, upon Montanistic tradition. Usher, in his introduction to the Epistle of Barnabas (*Carpzov.* 2. 2. p. LXVII) says with a keen irony, that Tertullian had a Montanistic inspiration (*Montani spiritu afflatus*) when he ascribed the Epistle to the Hebrews to Barnabas, for he is alone in this opinion, and the Epistle of Barnabas, which we possess, is so unequal in rank, that, in order to ascribe the latter, with some show of reason, to Barnabas, we must pronounce the former to be spurious.—The genuineness is in fact very doubtful (concerning its unsatisfactoriness see Hefele in the above named church lexicon) and for the view, that Barnabas is the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, (lately defended by Twesten, Ullman, and in particular Wieseler) there are important and most striking reasons. The Epistle is taken up particularly with the relationship of the priesthood of Christ and the Levitical of the O. T.; but Barnabas was, according to Acts 4: 36, a Levite. A Grecian training we might expect him to have, for he was from Cyprus, and therefore a Hellenist, Acts, 11: 20. It is no objection to this that he was taken for Jupiter, at Lystra, and Paul, on the other hand, for Mercury, because he was “the chief speaker;” Acts, 14: 12, for the poorest public speaker may be the most accomplished author. Moreover, the fact that this Epistle styles itself a “*word of entreaty*,” λόγος παρακλήσεως 13: 22 speaks strongly in his favor. But Βαρνάβας, the surname which the apostles gave him, Acts, 4: 36, signifies υἱὸς παρακλήσεως “*son of consolation*,” probably ἡγετᾶ (according to Hefele ἡγετᾶ ὡς divinely inspired speaker). Further, the original apostolic power, which appears in the Epistle, does not divert us from Barnabas, for he sustained so near a relationship to the apostles, that in the N. T. he is himself called an apostle, Acts 14: 31, (comp. 13: 1, where he appears to be reckoned among the prophets,) and the Pauline character of the Epistle is explained by the fact, that Barnabas was Paul’s friend and companion, and that for a long time, he labored with him at Antioch and on missionary tours. But, notwithstanding all these circumstances, which favor the opinion that Barnabas was the author of the Epistle, we are under the necessity of declaring our dissent from it, for the following reasons. (1.) We are not aware of the existence of such an intimate relationship between Barnabas and Timothy, as that which the author of this Epistle must have sustained towards him. (2.) There is no reliable tradition of a sojourn of Barnabas in Italy, where, the author was staying when he wrote; for, the pretence of the pseudo Clementine recognition, that Barnabas preached the gospel at Rome as early as during the life-time of Christ, and

that he made a proselyte of Clement of Rome, bears its falsehood upon its face, and if the church of Milan honors him as its founder, it builds upon an entirely baseless legend. (3.) The rash expression of Tertullian is not to be regarded as a church tradition, but it may possibly arise from an interchange of the pretended Epistle of Barnabas received by us for that to the Hebrews. It is, therefore, presumable that, as Tertullian, as far as we know, nowhere makes mention of the former, he cites the latter without further notice, as the Epistle of Barnabas.

Having seen that we are not under the necessity of fixing upon Apollos, and that no one in the primitive church thought of him; and also, that the supposition that Barnabas was the author had not any testimony from tradition in its favor, but had, on the contrary, weighty objections against it, we proceed to test the view which claims for Clement or Luke a participation in the composition of the Epistle. Inasmuch, however, as it is ascertained that Clement draws from the fountain of our Epistle, and only because of the approach made in some parts, by his Epistle to the Corinthians to that to the Hebrews, has he been looked upon as concerned in the latter, there only yet remains the view which claims for Luke a participation in its authorship. Eusebius (h. e. vi. 14,) gives us the information, derived from the Hypotyposes of Clement of Alexandria, that the Epistle to the Hebrews, as the latter asserts, is the work of Paul, but that it was originally written in Hebrew, and with special care translated by Luke for Hellenist readers, "in consequence of which, a similar coloring is found in the expression of thought in this Epistle, and in the Acts of the apostles."¹ To this expression of opinion by his teacher Clement, Origen refers, when he remarks that by certain persons ἐκ τῶν Λουκῆ was regarded as the writer of the Epistle. This, after renewed investigation, appears to me to be the most important and trustworthy testimony of antiquity concerning our Epistle.

Whilst the view, which ascribes to Clement of Rome a participation in this work, turns out to be a mere supposition of Eusebius and Jerome, to whom it looks for authority, and who base it upon the similarity of the two Epistles, Clement of Alexandria expresses not a mere supposition, but, as the connection of his declaration as given by Eusebius shows, what he had received from Pantänus, or, if the latter could not exactly be understood as meant by the blessed elder μακάριος πρεσ-

¹ ὁ δὲ τὸν αὐτὸν χρῆμα εὐρίσκεισθαι κατὰ τὴν ἐρμηνείαν ταύτης τε τῆς ἐπιστολῆς καὶ τῶν πράξεων.

βύτερος, what he had received as *tradition of those originally elders* παράδοσις τῶν ἀρχαίων πρεσβυτέρων (s. Credner §. 189.) and he does not first *infer* the participation of Luke from the similarity of expression in the Epistle and in the Acts, but he sets it down as a fact, and points to this resemblance of expression as a result of this fact. If now we compare the writings of Luke with the Epistle to the Hebrews, we become confirmed in the truth of the remark of Clement. Grotius had already, upon the basis of this observation, declared himself in favor of Luke, not only as author, but as independent author of the Epistle; but the similarity of expressions, to which he directs attention (they can be seen in De Wette's Int. §. 163,) can only be of avail as a test. Bleek is right (I. 405,) in declaring that we cannot build the proof of the authorship, or the coöperation of Luke on the agreement in the use of expressions referred to by Grotius. Of greater weight, however, is the similarity of the construction of sentences in the beginning of the Gospel of Luke to that in the Epistle to the Hebrews, as also the equal correctness of language in the Acts, precisely where Luke would write most as an independent author. If Bleek had, by using the labors of Hug, who amongst the moderns has regarded it as highly probable that Luke had some influence in the production of this Epistle, more carefully compared the style of Luke with that of the work before us, he would have found a similarity not insignificant, but surprising, and of the highest moment. The number of expressions in the N. T., exclusive of the Epistle to the Hebrews, which are used *only* by Luke, is considerable, such as: εὐδαμνέσθαι, εἰς τὸ παντελὲς, ἡγούμενοι, ἀρχηγὸς applied to Christ which arrested the attention of Grotius; but there are yet many others, e. g.: παροξυσμός, τελείωσις, πρόσφατος, μέτοχος, ἐπιστέλλειν, ἀλυσσινεῖς, comp. Luke 17: 2, &c. With these we may enumerate the forms of expression, which are so familiar with Luke in other places, e. g.: ὁ υἱὸς ὁ ὕψιστος, δίκονμένη, ἀπολύεσθαι, χρηματίζεσθαι, λαλεῖν πρὸς, with a preference in the use of compounded words, as ἐκπαιστύνεσθαι, διαμαρτύρεσθαι, and such like. It is particularly worthy of remark, that instead of εὐαγγέλιον Gospel, which does not at all appear in the Epistle to the Hebrews, he is accustomed to use, in connection with ὁ λόγος, such a circumlocution as παραλήψεως, the precise expression which recurs in Acts 13: 15; and that, instead of Ἱεροσόλυμα, *Jerusalem*, which the other three Evangelists use, Luke uses Ἱερουσαλήμ as does our Epistle. It is hoped, that at another place it will be convincingly shown, how remarkably, in numerous cases, the usage of language in the Epistle to the Hebrews can be illustrated from

the writing of Luke. I, indeed, take for granted with Bleek (*Contributions* p. 52), that the Gospel and the Acts, in their present form, actually belong, in connection with Paul, to Luke, to whom tradition ascribes them; the ingenious attempt of Zellers (*Jahrb.* 1848, 4,) to prove that the Gospel and afterwards the Acts first made their appearance in Rome, in the second century, having failed to convince me. If, therefore, the remark of Clement concerning the coloring given by Luke to the Epistle to the Hebrews, confirms itself, and the facts of the case favor the opinion of his coöperation in its production, such as the fact that he accompanied Paul when he was taken captive to Rome (*Acts* 27 : 2,) and there remained with him (*Col.* 4 : 14; *Philem.* 24; *ii Tim.* 4 : 11); also that he remained with him alone, whilst his second Epistle to Timothy was written, at which time Timothy was entreated to come to Rome before the winter should set in, the tradition that Luke was a co-author of the Epistle, (not indeed, as Clement says, as translator, but, according to the only admissible assumption of Origen, as constructor of the work out of materials afforded by the apostle) will ever remain the most probable account of the origin of this Epistle, which stands in the most intimate relationship to the Epistles of Paul written from Rome, and, in every point of view, belongs to the same period.

If, indeed, the single objection of Bleek, that Luke was a Hellenist, were of itself sufficient to exclude him, we would have used many words to no purpose. But even if, according to *Col.* 4 : 14, *comp.* 10, Luke was not of the circumcision, and although the *iv ἡμῖν among us*, *Luke* 1 : 1 appears to confirm it, or at least that he was a proselyte, his other writings still prove that he had a sufficiently deep acquaintance with both Judaism and christianity, to enable him under the direction of Paul, to compose this Epistle. But a yet stronger objection arises against every relation of Paul to this Epistle.—Where were these congregations of Jewish christians to whom the apostle could have stood in so intimate a spiritual relationship, as this author did? This conducts us to a second question equally difficult, the answer to which will have a reciprocal influence upon that of the former. The question is, whither was the Epistle directed?

The order of our examination is somewhat different here from that under the question referring to the author. We first enquire into what the ancient church declares concerning the readers, then, what the Epistle itself says. Between the testimony of the ancient church and the internal evidence lies the evidence of the superscription, *πρὸς Ἑβραίους* to the Hebrews.—

As it respects the testimony of the ancient church, Wieseler is of opinion, that it fixes partly upon the Laodiceans, partly upon the Alexandrians, and partly upon the christians of Palestine and Jerusalem as the persons addressed. But in the passage of Philastrius *haer.* 89, the *ad Laodicensēs* probably refers, as Bleek also understands it, not to the Epistle to the Hebrews, but to the Apocryphal one to the Laodiceans, and the view, that the former was written *ad Alexandrinos* to the Alexandrians, is no where distinctly maintained, Wieseler deriving it with too much confidence from the fragment concerning the canon of Muratori, (*fragmentum de canone*). The only view distinctly to be found in the ancient church was, that the Epistle was directed to the Jewish christians of Jerusalem, and of Palestine in general. The fact is not as Wieseler represents it, that Clement of Alexandria, according to Eusebius *h. e.* vi 14, appeared to have thought of the Jewish christians of Palestine; Clement, on the contrary, took this for granted, although he was not the first, but ὁ μακάριος πρεσβύτερος the *blessed elder*, as Clement tells us, already explained the absence of the superscription Παύλου ἀπόστολος *Paul the apostle* as caused by motives of modesty, since our Lord was himself the apostle of the Hebrews. That the Epistle was directed to Palestine, the original field of our Lord's labors, is also the meaning of the superscription πρὸς Ἑβραίους. This superscription is, in every view, the most ancient testimony as to the readers of the Epistle, with which the overrated and highly problematic *ad Alexandrinos* is not at all to be compared.—From the period at which we find direct reference to the Epistle, (as with Irenæus and Clement of Alex., and therefore since about the middle of the second century), it comes to us under the name ἡ πρὸς Ἑβραίους ἐπιστολή the *Epistle to the Hebrews* and under no other, and even where the Pauline authorship is called into question, the historical truth of the inscription πρὸς Ἑβραίους is readily taken for granted. As far, therefore, as our eye runs back into the antiquity of the church, the Epistle bears the inscription πρὸς Ἑβραίους, and this inscription is not first understood by Clement, but already in the circle of its ancient teachers, as referring to readers in Palestine. It is quite a different question whether this reference is the only one which is reliable and correct. Wieseler answers, no; we, yes. It is true, that the term Ἑβραίους in itself expresses national origin with respect to the land of residence, as Paul the Cilician Ἑβραίους ἐκ Ἑβραίων Hebrew of the Hebrews, Phil. 3: 5, 2 Cor. 11: 12; further, that in opposition to Ἕλληνισταὶ *Grecians* (Acts 6: 1, 9: 29,) it indicates those who adhered to the He-

brew language as the language of divine service, and in general to national customs; and that, therefore, the term Ἑβραῖοι could also be used in opposition to Ἑλληνισταί out of Palestine, although no passage of this kind, as far as I know, has thus far been pointed out. But it is just as true, that Ἑβραῖοι, where it is used absolutely, designates the Jews of Palestine. This Wieseler denies, only for the purpose of favoring his opposing hypothesis. But it is undoubtedly certain, that for example, the name εὐαγγελίου κατ' Ἑβραίους *gospel to the Hebrews* points to a Palestinian Hebrew gospel, and that passages in which it is expressed that Matthew has written ἐν Ἑβραίοις and has preached Ἑβραίοις, Ἑβραῖοι are those who, where the sense is not self-evident, are denominated οἱ ἐν τῇ Παλαιστίνῃ Ἑβραῖοι (Eus. *h. e.* v. 11.) In the N. T. itself, the Jewish christians of Jerusalem and Palestine are, indeed, no where called Ἑβραῖοι, but οἱ κατοικοῦντες ἐν Ἰουδαίᾳ ἀδελφοί *the brethren dwelling in Judea*, οἱ ἅγιοι οἱ ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ *the saints that are in Jerusalem*, also simply οἱ ἅγιοι *suaints* 1 Cor. 16: 1, 2 Cor. 8: 4, but should they, according to the analogy of inscription πρὸς Κορινθίους, πρὸς Γαλατάς &c., be designated by a single term (as Κορινθίους 2 Cor. 6: 11, Γαλαταί Gal. 3: 1) it could be only πρὸς Ἑβραίους.

The meaning of the inscription is, therefore, not equivocal. Should we be compelled, upon evidence of the Epistle itself, to seek for its readers out of Palestine, we should have to reject the inscription which does not admit of this supposition. We, therefore, ask the Epistle concerning its own testimony. The features found scattered over its face adapt themselves to the following picture of the church, as that to which it is directed. The church was founded by apostolic preaching, ch. 2: 3, and had existed for a considerable time; for it had already lost through death prominent members worthy of imitation, ch. 13: 7. It had already passed through scenes of suffering, in which, firm in faith and joyful in hope, it endured reproach, persecution and spoiling of goods, ch. 10: 32-34, and bestowed kindness and relief upon the poor and captive, ch. 6: 10, 10: 34. After a past experience, marked by firm adherence to the truth, it has now reached a season of danger, in which it has not yet resisted unto blood—a danger of becoming faint-hearted, and of denying the faith amidst its severe chastisements. This denial of the faith manifestly consists in apostasy from Christ, and a preference for the law of the Old Testament; the prevalence of various and strange doctrines διδασκαί ποικίλαι καὶ ξέναι entertained by the church (13: 9) which yield to the obsolete law, especially that forbidding meats (comp. 12: 16 with 13: 9) or, as others explain it, that of the feasts

of sacrifices, a permanently high value, since, until this time, the church has not advanced beyond the first principles of christian doctrine, and in consequence of this want of progress has fallen into danger of being led into error (5: 12, ff.) Already members of the church, to escape reproach and persecution (12: 3), "forsake the assembling of themselves together," perhaps to appear as if attached to the temple service and steadfast adherents of Judaism. The danger of this apostacy or return to Judaism, already to a certain extent accomplished, constitutes the occasion and groundwork of the Epistle, for, besides the doctrines taught, there are to be seen every where warnings of judgments threatened against apostacy to Judaism, which must be the more terrible just in proportion as the new is more excellent than the old covenant. If, therefore, we take into connection this picture of the circumstances of the church to which the Epistle is directed, and the inscription *προς Ἑβραίους* i. e., to the Jewish christians of Palestine, two important doubts arise, in opposition to which adherence to the opinion that the Epistle was directed to readers in Palestine, and that it was of Pauline origin, seems to be a pure impossibility.—How could observing the commands concerning meats or participation in the temple service be regarded as apostacy in a church at Jerusalem, since the Jewish christians of that city had continued to adhere to the Mosaic law of meats, for during the imprisonment of Paul, according to Acts 21: 20-25, they were the more zealous for the law in consequence of the fact that they were just then contending with foreign churches about the Old Testament ordinances and Jewish privileges. This consideration appears to render the supposition that the Epistle was directed to Jerusalem impossible; for the very thing to which it warns them not to apostatize, constituted, from the beginning, the prevailing and peculiar character of the mother-church.—But if Paul were the author of the Epistle, and warned against Jewish legality, why, throughout the whole, do we not read a single word concerning that high estimation of lineal descent, of Sabbath and Holydays, and of circumcision which is incompatible with the christian principle of saving (*πίστις*) faith. It is indeed uncertain whether *βρώματα* meats (13: 9) refers to the law concerning clean and unclean, or much rather, as Bleek, Wieseler and others suppose, to that relating to meals at sacrifices. But if even the reference to forbidden meats is the more probable, as soon as we compare this Epistle with that to the Colossians, with which there are many points of contact (Col. 2: 16, 17,) it appears very remarkable that the word *περιτομή* circumcision does not once occur in our Epistle, whilst

in that to the Colossians (2: 11, ff.) a circumstantial account is given of what has been substituted in the New Testament for the outward circumcision of the Old. In view of this consideration, it would seem that every thought of Jerusalem and Paul must be relinquished. Wieseler has recourse from them to Alexandria. He supposes that any special controversy against adherence to Jewish doctrines and customs must have been unnecessary with the Jewish christians of Alexandria; for they had a thorough bias of a spiritualistic and Grecianizing tendency; that on the contrary, the caution against a return to the temple service is easily explicable when referred to them, for since the time of Ptolemy Philometor, the Egyptian Jews had a temple of their own, built at Leontopolis by Onias, a priest, who had escaped from Jerusalem, in contrasting which with that at Jerusalem, they prided themselves much; and that this temple and its service, and not that at Jerusalem, is referred to in this Epistle.

But the reasons, which Wieseler produces for this opinion, are all untenable. The Greek style of the Epistle does not divert our attention from Palestine, for independently of the fact that the Greek language had at no period taken root so deeply, and embraced so many countries within its influence, as in the first century of the Roman Empire (Thiersch Versuch s. 53), everything that is strange in style vanishes before the very natural assumption that the author would write his Epistle, designed immediately for the Jewish christians of Palestine, in a language comprehensible at the same time by the whole church. Just as little does the constant reference back to the Old Testament according to the Septuagint, lead us away from Palestine to Egypt. How remarkable, says Wieseler, is this use of the Septuagint, even where it departs from the original text, if the author wrote to the inhabitants of Palestine, where this version had no authority? But this argument destroys itself; for if, at that time, the Septuagint had no authority in Palestine, its constant use in the New Testament, especially in the Gospels, is inexplicable. The recognized authority of the Septuagint, at that time, by both Hebrew and Hellenic Jews, is a fact taken for granted in the use of Scripture throughout the whole New Testament. This is confirmed by the fact, that Josephus has it always in view in his Archæology, and follows it even where it deviates considerably from the received Hebrew text (*e. g.* in reckoning the years of the patriarchs living before the Deluge,) and also that the oldest Palestinian notices contained in the Mechilta and Talmud speak with respect of the Septuagint (Frankel, intro-

ductory studies to the Septuagint, 1841, p. 25, ff.) As neither the Greek idiom, nor the use of the Septuagint in the Epistle leads us away from Palestine, so also its expressions concerning the temple worship do not lead us to Egypt. In the description of the inner temple (9: 1-5) several difficulties indeed do present themselves, which excite the suspicion that the author had only an imperfect conception of it. Difficult and suspicious also is the declaration (7: 27, 10: 11) that the high-priest καὶ ἡμέραν daily "offered up sacrifice." Wieseler presents these difficulties in as strong a light as possible, in order to bring the decried author again into credit through the confident assertion, that he did not at all speak of the temple at Jerusalem, but of that of Onias at Leontopolis. This temple, according to Josephus (*Arch.* and especially *Bell.* 7, 10, 3,) was in some things similar, and in others dissimilar to that at Jerusalem. It was like a tower, for it stood upon a foundation of stone, built up sixty feet high. The altar of burnt offering and holy furniture it had, were like those in the temple at Jerusalem, only the golden candle-support was not a candlestick, but it was suspended, like a chandelier, by a golden chain. If now the author of our Epistle had mentioned a golden chandelier, instead of a golden candelabrum, or if it could be shown that the golden altar of incense, as appears according to 9: 3, 4, had stood behind the second veil, these circumstances would have commended to favor, or perhaps have confirmed the supposition of Wieseler; but not the least of the kind can be produced in its favor. There are, however, two things which go to show it to be without foundation. Our author speaks of a most holy place, which contained the ark of the covenant, with the pot of manna and Aaron's rod; the most holy place of the second temple was, however, empty, for the holy furniture belonging to it was irrecoverably lost. From this, Wieseler should have inferred that our author intended to describe neither the Herodian nor the Egyptian temple, but the temple as it was according to the Old Testament law. Besides, during the first century of the Christian Era, the conceit of the Egyptian Jews, but especially of those of Alexandria, for the temple of Onias, had not manifested itself strongly. Onias is said to have justified his building of this opposition temple by Isaiah, 19: 19, but the believing Israelite could not regard it in any other light than a ναὶ a chapel. It is for this reason that in Egypt pilgrimages to Jerusalem were not at any time forbidden, and that its temple never obtained great admirers or defenders; the Jews objected to it, that it stood not on Mount Moriah, and the Samaritans of Alexandria that it was not built

upon Mount Gerizim (Jost. *general history of the Israelites* in two vols., I, 515, ff.) Nor could the Alexandrians even admire it, for they had there that palace-like synagogue, of which the Talmud says, that he who has not seen it, has never seen the glory of Israel, and that at times it contained so great a multitude, that it exceeded twice the number that came out of Egypt under Moses. But their yearly consecrated gifts they brought to Jerusalem, and not to Leontopolis (Frankel p. 186). Philo, the Alexandrian, himself relates (II. 646,) that he once journeyed through Askelon to Jerusalem, in order to offer up prayer and sacrifices in the temple of the fatherland (εἰς τὸ πατρῶν ἱερὸν ἐστειλλόμεν ἐυχόμενός τε καὶ θύσων; see the *history of Hebrew poetry*, p. 206.) When, therefore, we reflect, that there is nothing in the Epistle to direct us to the Egyptian temple; that this had nothing to support its claims but a misinterpreted passage of the word of God; and that even in Egypt, and especially amongst the Jews of Alexandria, it never gained a proper respect and acknowledgement, the supposition of Wieseler falls to the ground.

Still, by showing that this supposition is without foundation, the proof that Jerusalem was the place of residence of those to whom the Epistle was addressed, and that it had a Pauline origin, has not yet, by any means, been completed; both of the above named formidable difficulties still remain to be overcome. An attempt, very worthy of attention, to overcome these difficulties, has lately been made by Thiersch in his (*comm. historica de epistola ad Hebraeos*) historical commentary concerning the Epistle to the Hebrews (Marburgi 1848, 4,) in which he promises at another time to produce the proof, that Barnabas wrote the Epistle, and that with his consent, Paul through the epilogue made it his own. The Epistle, according to the views of Thiersch (vgl. dagegen Versuch zur Herstellung, u. s. w., s. 264,) is to be regarded, not so much as one of caution against apostacy unto Judaism, as one of comfort to the Jewish christians of Jerusalem in their exclusion from the common worship which they sustained at the hands of the rest of their people. The Jewish christians of Palestine very justly regarded themselves as bound to the national law, and only this rejection out of their old religious connexions could first burst the fetters by which they felt themselves bound to the law. This expulsion took place after the death of Festus, (63.) Before the arrival of the new procurator, Albinus, the cruel Sadducean high priest Annas called the Sanhedrim together, and this body, transcending its lawful authority, condemned James, the brother of our Lord, and several other christians, to

be stoned to death, as transgressors of the law. From this time there began a continued persecution against christians, although the Pharisees disapproved of the conduct of their opponents, although the procurator was displeased with the high priest for his unlawful exercise of power, and although king Agrippa deposed Annas after being in office three months (*Jos. Ant.* last book.) Thiersch concludes from the Talmud that the Nazarenes had to endure much from the Jews, particularly in Galilee, at the beginning of the Jewish war, and he thinks that the persecution under Nero, which broke out in the year 64, sufficiently proves that the disposition of the Roman magistrates had, at that time, undergone a change in consequence of false complaints and reports. The particular circumstances of the condition of the christians of Palestine, he borrows from the Epistle itself. It comforts them in the trial in which they found themselves, as they saw that they were cast out of the communion of the temple, and arms them against the danger of a denial of Christ, in that it shows them the dignity of the New Testament church and its worship, by presenting to their view the dignity of its High priest and Mediator; and consequently, how easily they could dispense with the old worship by offerings and the communion of the old Jerusalem. The High Priesthood and sacrifice of the New Testament are so much the subject of discourse, because, whilst they might indeed be excluded from participation in the temple service, it was otherwise with the observance of circumcision, of the Sabbath, and of the rules forbidding meats. Thiersch has sought to substantiate his views by an ingenious allegorical interpretation of the eleventh chapter. His views are the more worthy of attention, because between A. D. 63 (the death of Festus) and 66, (the beginning of the Jewish war) a very suitable historical point of time occurred for our epistle.

We cannot, however, share in the views of Thiersch. For there is not a single word which clearly refers to the occurrence of that expulsion which has been presupposed. How adapted to this purpose is the context of 13: 12, 13. Jesus was forcibly thrust without the gate, to die as a transgressor.—Hence the author might have said: let us joyfully suffer when we too are thrust out; he, however, rather speaks of a willing going forth, and says: *τοῖνυν ἐπερχόμεθα πρὸς αὐτόν* "let us go forth, therefore, to him." But in the second place, 13: 9 contains a warning against doctrines which meddle with the ceremonial of meats, as *διδασκαίαι ποικίλαι καὶ ζῆναι* "*divers and strange doctrines.*" Thirdly, it is not at all supposable, that Paul should take part in an Epistle, which presupposes the contin-

ued observance of the Jewish law by Jewish christians as the rule, and does not as much admonish them to detach themselves from Judaism, as comfort those who saw themselves forcibly thrust out. But the above doubts against the Pauline origin of the Epistle, and against Jerusalem as the place to which it was directed, are not yet entirely disposed of, by what has been said.

They are, however, removed, when we take into consideration, first, that nowhere in the Epistle does the frequenting of the temple or the observance of Jewish ordinances appear to constitute the essence of the denial of Christ, against which he utters his warning; secondly, that in general, on the question whether the readers should still regard themselves as bound to the Jewish law or not, 13: 9 only can be taken to have an indirect reference to it. If we now reflect, that the whole Epistle nevertheless aims at withdrawing its readers from attachment to the legality of the Old Testament, by exhibiting to them the superiority of the divine service of the New Testament over that of the Old, and at fortifying them against the danger of a relapse into Judaism, which rejects Christ, there must be a special reason for the fact, that nowhere is there to be found a direct condemnation of the continued observance of the Old Testament ordinances, and that nowhere is any thing said of the incompatibility of the keeping of the Jewish law with Christianity. This is a matter of surprise, and it makes no difference whither the Epistle was directed, or whether the church, to which it was sent, was composed of purely Jewish christians or not; the context has always an intimate reference to circumcision, Sabbaths, and other kindred subjects. The author must, therefore, have designedly avoided a direct dispute concerning the observance of the law by Jewish christians, and this design can only be found in the exercise of a wise tenderness towards his readers. And towards what church was such prudent tenderness more demanded by duty and the circumstances of the case, than towards the mother church at Jerusalem, which grew up upon Jewish soil and in a Jewish atmosphere, and whose rupture with Judaism was not to be forced by stormy demands, but to be expected through divine Providence. And should we not entrust such tenderness to Paul, who circumcised Timothy on account of the Jews, Acts 16: 3, and, during his last stay in Jerusalem, so far yielded to the veneration of the church there for the law of their fathers, that he visited the temple and permitted offerings to be made for him; who, in all his apostolic journeys among the Heathen, bore the saints at Jerusalem upon his heart; and who (1. Cor.

9 : 20) says of himself, that to the Jews he had become a Jew, that he might gain the Jews. How such a condescension was possible without a denial of Christ, is explained by our Epistle, which does not come into direct collision with Jewish prejudices, but yet contrasts the Old and New Testament in such a manner, that everything having reference to the law must sink into insignificance before the substance itself of salvation and the surpassing glory of the New Testament. So much the more distinct, however, is the direct warning given against denying Jesus as the Son of God, and as Christ, and forsaking the christian worship. E. M. Röth, who, in a certain Latin essay (*Frankf. a. M.* 1836) has attempted to prove that our Epistle was not addressed to Jewish, but to Heathen christians, namely, to the Ephesians, and was written by Apollos, has entirely misapprehended this important characteristic. If the Epistle had been addressed to Jewish christians, he concludes that it must, above all things, have treated of the Messiahship and second coming of Jesus; for only in these points of faith is Jewish christianity distinguished from Judaism. Apart from the fact, that Röth's representation of Jewish christianity is not historically correct, since he ran astray in Rabbinic literature, precisely that which he omitted to notice in our Epistle, is one of its fundamental characteristics. The relapse, against which it utters its warning, is not a relapse into a Jewish observance of the law which is only indirectly attacked, but into a denial of Christ and his second appearing. At this time, the church of Jerusalem and the affiliated churches of Palestine stood in great danger of this relapse. She had passed through a great persecution, 10 : 32, viz : that which was connected with the martyrdom of Stephen, Acts 8 : 1. About seven years later, James the elder was torn from her, and Herod Agrippa persecuted the christians in order to ingratiate himself with the Jews; Acts 12 : 1, ff. She, therefore, counted martyrs and confessors amongst her ἡγούμενοι *rulers*, of whom our Epistle reminds us as of examples 13 : 7. If the chronology of Josephus is more reliable than that of Hegeſippus, James the younger had also, perhaps, suffered martyrdom at the time of the writing of our Epistle. The time then present, was indeed not a time of bloody persecution, but yet a time of affliction and of reproach, in which a steadfastness and a fidelity in faith and profession were needed, prepared to resist unto blood. In this fidelity, the apostle, captive at Rome, sought herein to strengthen the distant church, in that he unfolds to them, by the hand of Luke, the heavenly glory of the new covenant.— And should we be surprised that he should urge the Hebrews

to pray for him, that "he might soon be restored to them again." There is to him the same attraction towards Jerusalem, that urged him thither about four years before, although "the Holy Ghost witnessed in every city," "that bonds and afflictions" awaited him there.

ARTICLE III.

THE PROTESTANT PRINCIPLE IN ITS RELATIONS.

Translated from the German of Thomasius, by C. Philip Krauth, Editor of the Review.

WE undertook in a former article, to show how the essential doctrines of our church confessions were either implicitly contained in that of justification, or necessarily followed from it. Designedly did we restrict ourselves to the older confessions, and reserve for special consideration the relation of the Formula Concordiae to them. This is necessary, for it is undeniable that the form of concord is looked upon with prejudice by many friends of Evangelical truth. It may be assumed that it is still viewed in the unfavorable light, in which Plank, in his history of the Protestant faith placed it; and this is not to be wondered at, when we look at the various opinions, which from his time to that of Thiersch, have been expressed about it, and generally, we must add, from an entire misapprehension of the subject. It has been censured both on account of its form, and its contents. In reference to its form, it has been objected, that it wears much more the form of a theological dissertation than that of a confession; and in this there is some truth, at least in regard to the *Solida Declaratio*. The Epitome cannot, with any justice, with its clear and precise form, be exposed to this objection; it lays down its positive and negative positions with so much acuteness and clearness, and maintains so happily the didactic confessional manner, that it leaves nothing, in this respect, to be desired; indeed it surpasses in this the *Augustana*. In the *S. Declaratio*, theological explanation and argument are predominant, and as this obviously does not belong to the confession, as this latter more especially pertains to the *credimus*, *docemus* and *confitemur*, the reproach mentioned above cannot entirely be removed. Notwithstanding it is not to be overlooked, first, that this defect is remedied by the prefixed Epitome, and secondly, that the *Declaratio* is

designed mainly for theologians, and finally, that the circumstances which gave rise to their composition made an extended theological discussion indispensable. There were a series of controversies, internal and external, in which the church was involved, during the life of Luther, and more fully after his death. Controversies, which embraced very difficult questions, and in which every thing depended upon an accurate statement of the *Status Controversiae*, and the justification of the decision by the necessary proofs from scripture. It is plain that this could not be accomplished without Theology; why should the form of concord be condemned for that which is admired in the apology?

The contents then will furnish the ground for opposition.— In estimating it, every thing depends upon the two questions, first, what importance attaches to those points which the form of concord sanctions, and second, in what relation they stand to the principle of our church and the contents of the earlier symbolical writings, particularly the *Augustana*. On both points, the document itself speaks in the most unequivocal manner. In the introduction, it is repeatedly asserted, that it aims at presenting no new or other doctrine, than is contained in the *Augustana*; the hope is expressed that the elucidation of the litigated points will furnish the proof, that we adhere tenaciously to the Augsburg Confession, and its lucid and christian doctrines. It proposes, then, to be regarded as a repetition (*repetitio*) and an explanation of the Aug. Conf. (*explicatio genuinae sententiae Augustanae Confessionis*.¹)

The disputed doctrines, which their decisions embraced, are characterized as weighty and important matters; they are not, it is said, logomachies (*λογμαχίαι*) or disputations empty and unnecessary, such as arise when one party does not sufficiently understand the other, but grave matters of controversy, and such entirely as, that the views which depart from the truth can

¹The reason for incorporating with our summary of doctrine, the writings mentioned above, viz., the Augsburg Confession, the Apology, the Schmalkald articles, the small and large Catechism of Luther, is because these have always been regarded as the general and conceded views of our church, and as what had been subscribed by the leading and most enlightened Theologians of the times, and introduced into all Evangelical churches and schools. These all (as before mentioned) were written and published before the controversies amongst divines of the Aug. Conf. had arisen, and as they are considered impartial and cannot be rejected by any of the parties, so no one, who has sincerely received them, can discard them, but must readily receive and submit to them as witnesses. No one can, therefore, find fault with us for reverting to them for illustration and proof of the contested doctrines, and as we make the word of God the sole foundation, so do we use these writings in support of the truth, and as the clear and unanimous exposition to which our forefathers adhered. Solid. Dec. ed. Walch, p. 690.

regard to the differences which we have now before us. It follows that great importance was attached to them; justice requires that we should from this point judge the zeal and bitterness with which the contest was carried on. They felt that they were contending for the highest interests, and this claims our respect, though we may frequently regret the spirit displayed. This judgment on these controverted doctrines is not merely subjective, but has its justification in facts. For the points in dispute were such as stood in immediate connection with justification, or with those doctrines which the older confessions had asserted, as we will show hereafter. In regard to the decisions of the formula of concord, their conformity to those of the older confessions, has been universally admitted in the Lutheran church. Not only the eighty-six evangelical princes who adopted it, and the eight thousand ministers who subscribed it, together with the numerous Lutheran churches which subsequently adopted it, are witnesses in its favor, but those who did not subscribe, are likewise witnesses in its behalf. With the exception of the Provinces, which were already Calvinistic, and therefore soon united with the Reformed, who are, as a matter of course, not taken into the account, with this exception, the greater part of the Lutheran magistrates and cities, which declined signature, for instance, Pomerania, Holstein, Hesse Cassel, Anhalt, Nürnberg, Magdeburg, declared themselves, at the same time, in general, satisfied with the Conf.¹ Their objections were unimportant; they particularly avowed their concurrence in the views of Luther in regard to the Lord's Supper. Their exceptions were directed against the article in regard to the person of Christ, not indeed against the thing itself, but the, as it appeared to them, too subtle conception of it, and the manner in which it was brought into connection with the Lord's Supper,² in ad-

them in a true christian faith and maintain one baptism and sacrament.—Seckendorff Hist. Luth. v. Frick, p. 966.

¹ See the satisfactory proofs in Köllner in den Symb. der Luth. Kirch.—Hamburg 1837, s. 556, 573.

² We communicate some of these decisions from the original documents of Hutter in the Concordia Concors. The Hesse Cassel divines explain in their thoughts upon the article of the Lord's Supper: "De Cæna domini nostri Jesu Christi de qua septimus articulus agit, jam pro dolor ab initio restitute lucis Evangelii, ad hoc usque tempus, grave et satis perniciosum certamen fuit. In nostris autem ecclesiis aliter non docuimus, nec deinceps etiam aliter docere statuimus per Dei gratiam, quam quod in vero usu s. Coenae, una cum pane et vino, verum, essentiale, praesens corpus Christi, quod pro nobis in ara crucis in mortem est traditum, et verus, essentialis, praesens sanguis Domini nostri Jesu Christi, qui pro nobis in ara crucis effusus est, non tamen externo, naturali, sed interno et soli fidei comprehensibili modo, exhibetur,

dition, the rejection not so much of Synergism itself, for in regard to that, they were agreed, but several Melancthonian expressions which they received in a different sense. Some considered an additional confession unnecessary, as the earlier ones embraced the substance; others had entirely different views. It must be explicitly noticed, remarks the most recent, learned commentator on these relations, "that a considerable part of those who did not concur, did not decline on dogmatic grounds, but partly from political considerations, voluntary and compulsory, partly from attachment to Melancthon, partly from wounded pride, because they were not active participants, partly because in a particular territory, the persons of most influence were Calvinistic, whilst the greater part of the teachers were favorable to the doctrines of the Formula Concordiae.

sumatur, et percipiatur, a dignis pariter et indignis: a dignis quidem ad fidei confirmationem, et sic ad eorum salutem: ab indignis autem ad iudicium.— Quoniam ergo theologorum, qui (Torgae) congregati fuerunt, copiosa et perspicua hujus articuli explicatio, quantum ad thesina et antithesin attinet, in fundamento cum nostra sententia et doctrina congruit, in declaratione illa acquiescimus."—On the article concerning the person of Christ. "Hodie de hoc articulo ideo controvertitur, quod Zwingliani et Calvinistae hoc ipso et aliis articulis fidei (quales sunt, ascendit in coelum, et sedet ad dexteram Dei) probare se posse autumant, Christum nec verum et essentiale suum corpus manducandum, nec verum et essentialem sanguinem suum in s. coena nobis dare posse. Quamvis autem articulus hic non sit proprium fundamentum et sedes, ex qua praesentia corporis et sanguinis Christi in s. coena demonstratur: sed verba institutionis: Accipite, editae, etc. fidem nobis certam faciunt, quod Christus in vero usu sacramenti hujus nos vero suo corpore et vero suo sanguine cibet ac potet: tamen fundamento huic et sedi propriae non adversatur, uti nonnulli opinantur. Sed quemadmodum verba coenae testantur, velle Christum nobis dare verum suum corpus et verum suum sanguinem: ita quoque hic (nempe articulus de persona Christi) et reliqui articuli de ascensione Christi, et sessione ejus ad dexteram Dei, testantur et confirmant, quod suum corpus et sanguinem suum in s. coena nobis dare possit. Proinde recte ille explicatur, et simul ostenditur veritatem humanae naturae in Christo, ejusque ascensionem in coelos, et sessionem ad dextram patris, praesentiam corporis et sanguinis Christi in s. coena nequaquam impedire. Quemadmodum enim sessio ad dextram patris, ad quam in ascensione sua assumptus est Christus, non intelligenda est de certo aliquo coeli loco, in quem Christi corpus tanquam inclusum et captivum receptum sit, sic ut alibi, etiam quod illud verbo suo destinatum sive ordinatum esse nequeat, sed de divina omnipotentia et gloria, in qua Christus cum patre suo regnat ac omnia gubernat: ita statuimus et docemus, licet Christus verus et naturalis homo sit et maneat, non tamen propterea sequi, corpus et sanguinem ejus in s. coena non posse distribui et percipi: sed quia humanitas Christi ab aeterno dei filio assumpta, et sic cum deitate *ἀδιασπέρως* unita est, potius inde sequitur, et irrefragabiliter probatur, quod Christus, tanquam omnipotens et verus deus, ubicunque velit, possit corpore suo adesse: ideoque etiam in s. coena juxta promissionem suam verum suum corpus et sanguinem ad edendum et bibendum distribuere possit."

The Brunswick Divines, together with those of Helmstadt, presented their exceptions at the conference of Rittershausen (Riddagshausen) on the 9th of Aug. 1576, making no objections to the article on the Lord's Supper, but in regard to that on the person of Christ, expressing the desire that the absolute

From this it appears, that it was not everywhere dissent from the doctrines which produced the unwillingness to subscribe. In addition to this, at a later period, it was virtually adopted in the countries and regions in which it had not been; and the ministers of the church ascribed to it a high authority.¹ To this candid judgment, we annex that of one of the most determined opponents, Plank, who took pains to exercise impartiality towards all except the Lutherans, who poured contempt and sarcasm on the entire work of pacification, and knew how to place it in the most unfavorable light; this historian feels himself compelled to acknowledge, "It is almost beyond controversy, that in the formula, in every controverted doctrine, precisely the view was introduced and sanctioned, which was

ubiquity might not be asserted. In the article on the person of Christ it is concluded, that it is necessary, that as the appellatio communicationis idiomatum is by many applied to the first genus, and under that pretext the others are entirely excluded and rejected, that on this account it ought to be guarded at the general synod, whether the opinion was not, that the appellatio communicationis idiomatum was used as a commune genus, under which all three were embraced, and to each one his special definition and appellatio was attributed;" at a meeting at Brunswick, a part of them, together with divines from Lower Saxony (from Gosslar, Göttingen, Hannover, Nordheim, &c.,) explain: "We have discovered that, nearly throughout, the formula is word for word, what was before this, a year ago, decided in these churches, and unanimously approved, except some small additions made in the conference at Torgau, which were properly added for elucidation from Luther's writings, and we declare that in the churches we maintain the doctrines in regard to controverted articles as they are set forth in this formula, and therefore coincide with, and are satisfied with this formula; it is our purpose too, by the help of God, to adhere to the form of doctrine, and are resolved not merely in our ministry, but before our christian magistrates so to uphold them, that not only in churches and schools, with the present generation they may be received, but that this deposit may be transferred to posterity."

Remarkable is the decidedly rejecting decision of Holstein through Paul von Eitzen, who gives, as a ground why they need no new symbolical book, the circumstance "because all the controverted articles handled in the new formula, are clearly explained in the old symbols," and as a further proof, the formula of ordination used in Holstein expresses: "I swear fourthly and particularly, that the words of my Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ, in his holy Supper and Testament, namely, "This is my body which was given for you, this is my blood of the New Testament, which was shed for you and for many, for the forgiveness of sins," I hold and believe truly in the simple true sense of the plain words, namely: that the true actual body of my Savior, Jesus Christ, who gave himself to death for me on the cross; and the true actual blood of Christ, my Savior, which was shed for me, is truly present in the Lord's Supper, and is really distributed in every part of the world,

¹ Köllner a. a. O. S. 581. Vgl. J. G. Walch, *Introductio in lib. eccl. luth. symb. Jen. 1738* p. 732. Merito pro symbolo ecclesiae lutheranae habetur, ejus quippe, quae Augustanae Confessionis invariatae est addicta. Quamvis enim sint inter nostrae religionis Confessores, qui huic formulae subscribere recusarunt, ipsam tamen doctrinam in ista propositam haud rejecerunt. Non sequitur, ut, qui scripto huic nomen dare noluerit, simul ipsius scriptum ac quam tradidit doctrinam veluti erroneam rejecerit. Vgl. p. 722 ff.

most clearly sustained by the Augsburg Confession, by the Apology for it, by the Schmalkald articles, and by the Catechisms of Luther. At most, the article in regard to the person of Christ alone admitted of plausible doubt, whether it was presented in the formula as it had been in those writings; but even here it was not very difficult, by a succession of deductions, to prove that it was involved in them." (Protest. Lehr-

where the Lord's Supper is administered according to the institution of Christ and is received by all who go to the Lord's table, as the Lord's words express. As this doctrine of the Holy Sacrament is explained in the Augsburg Confession, the Apology, the Schmalkald articles, and the two Catechisms of our holy Father and Teacher, Luther, which Confession and writings, I hold and believe in this article, rightly and truly, and obligate myself, by this, my oath, by the help and grace of God, to present to my congregation the same true simple doctrine of the Lord's Supper, without perversion and change, and to teach it till my death. Sixthly, and specially I hold and declare that the doctrine of the Anabaptists, and the perverters of the Sacrament, Carlstadians, Zuinglians, Calvinists, Bezaites, or by whatever name they are, or may be called—in opposition to the necessity and power of holy baptism, and against the true presence, distribution and reception of the true actual body and blood of Christ in the holy Supper, wherever it is properly administered throughout the church, according to the institution of Christ is wrong, false, untrue and deceptive. But I will help to uphold and to propagate, by the grace of God, and the Spirit's aid, the unchangeable, true doctrine and faith concerning the truth and Omnipotence of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the inseparable union of his divine and human natures in the one undivided person of Christ, and the true actual presence of the true body and blood of Christ in the holy Supper." In addition, the opposition of Paul von Eitzen had its origin in pique against Andrea. Hutter says, he had *praeconceptum quoddam animo odium contra D. Jacobum*; which is confirmed by Plank, s. 494.

Comp. on this J. G. Walch, *Einleitung in die Rel. Streitigkeiten der Ev. l. Kirche*, Bd. iv, 450. Löscher *Historia motuum* Bd., iii, p. 262, where there are pregnant proofs. 3, B. Likewise in Zweibrück it was brought about that the Form. Conc. was adopted on the 23d of August, and subscribed in September. The Pomeranians, finally, who were mainly concerned about the Apology of their Corpus doctrinae, started, as to the matter, a difficulty in regard to the article on conversion, which grew out of a misapprehension, comp. J. G. Walch loc. cit., but profess themselves satisfied with the article on the Lord's Supper and the person of Christ; only they desired a very copious exposition, as they belonged to the most decided friends and defenders of church orthodoxy. The Pomeranian church order of the year 1563, confesses: "In regard to the Lord's Supper should be taught harmoniously, that we receive in it the true body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ with the bread and wine, and that the Lord Jesus Christ is present in the Sacrament, not merely with his grace, spirit and power, but really with his body and blood, as the words of Christ express: This is my body, this is my blood which believers receive to life, and the unworthy and impenitent to condemnation."

Further, the Pomeranians in the year 1593 assumed the three articles of the Formula Conc.: in respect to the Lord's Supper, the person of Christ and the election of grace as their standard in the controversies with the Reformed, the whole at a late period comp. Walch loc. cit. p. 451, 454.

In regard to the substance of the doctrine, the Anhalt divines alone properly dissented, who were Calvinistic, and the Nürnbergers, who were, in addition, influenced by other causes. This will suffice to establish the position taken above.

begr. vi. 697.) Little as we approve of the manner in which he expresses himself, we wished to direct attention to this acknowledgment, particularly with a reference to those, who regard him as the highest authority, when he treats so slightly, the Formula of Concord.

We propose to develop the double truth uttered before from history. Not that we propose to give a history of those controversies, or even to recount all the points, which the limits of this Magazine could not receive; our purpose is to furnish the evidence in a few leading points. We asserted that the controverted points stood partly in a direct and partly in an indirect relation to the primary principle of the Lutheran church.

The first is true particularly of the controversies before the interim, the second of those which connected themselves with it. Taking up, in the first place, the first series. They were the contests with Agricola, Osiander and the Enthusiasts or fanatics, as they are denominated.

a. In the first, the Antinomian controversies, the relation of the law to the Gospel is discussed. The contradiction, which John Agricola of Eisleben, in the year 1527, expressed against the celebrated instructions prepared by Melanchthon and published by Luther, for the Visitors, to the ministers in the Electorate of Saxony, may have been founded in a mistake. He saw in the manner in which the law was placed in the van, an attack upon the Protestant principle, a denial of Christian freedom and a return to papacy.¹

But the denial that true repentance came from the law, would appear suspicious, and particularly when ten years afterwards he renewed his protest with a more full disclosure of his theory, he which had in the mean time perfected. He did this in a series of propositions (*Propositiones inter fratres*) which he published anonymously in the year 1537.

He here lays down the two theses; 1. repentance should be taught not from the ten commandments, or any law of Moses, but from the sufferings and death of the Son of God by means of the Gospel; 2. the law is not to be taught, neither as the beginning, middle nor end of the righteousness of man. What he means by beginning of righteousness, he explains at once more minutely, when, on the one hand, he asserts, that the law alone reproves sin and does this without the Holy

¹ Reprehendit, says Melanchthon, quod non doceam inchoari poenitentiam ab amore justitia, quod de legis praedicatione urgenda nimius sim, quod quibusdam locis christianam libertatem laeserim; facit me his papistam. Sic audio apud amicos. (*Corpus Reform.* I. 920.)

Ghost, and therefore it reproves it to condemnation; on the other hand rejects as erroneous the declaration of Luther, that the principal use and function of the law is to alarm the conscience, that it may more readily know Christ; and how he understands the expression middle and end, appears from this, that he restricts the law to the external works and doings of life and would banish the decalogue from the pulpit to the hall of justice.¹ We see, he not only denies the pedagogical character of the law, in virtue of which it produces the knowledge of sin, repentance and a desire of salvation; he refuses to it the character of divinity. "It does not confer the spirit, it is not deserving of the title word of God." And from this, he further concludes, that it has no commanding power, and that within the bounds of Christianity it is of no authority. Even the passage of the Apostle, 2 Pet. 1: 10: Give diligence &c., does not please him. For Peter did not understand the nature of Christian liberty. It is not necessary to prove that these views are directly destructive of the formal principle of the Lutheran church, and at the same time its doctrine of the relation of the law to the Gospel, as it is unfolded in the Augsburg Confession and its Apology (see former Article,) is directly contradicted. Just as plainly do their pernicious consequences appear; the result of their reception would be the diminution of the divine holiness and with it the possibility of true repentance; they must nullify the conviction of the necessity of the redemption through Christ from the curse of the law, and finally introduce into the christian life that false liberty, which, rejecting the divine law, discards all divine control and degenerates into licentiousness. All this Luther, in his six powerful disputations against the Antinomians, adduced against Agricola, and the subsequent renewal of the same errors by the pastor Poach of Erfurth, Otto of Nordhausen, and others,² shows how well founded was the apprehension of the great Reformer, that by means of this doctrine,

¹ Luther's Werke. Walch 20. 20. 32. Arnold K. Gesch. 2. 16. 45.

² Poach maintained "that the law, even when fulfilled, had no promise of everlasting life and stood in no relation to eternal life." S. Salig Gesch. der Augs. Konf. III. p. 59—Schlüsselburg Catal. Haeret. VII. 274 ff. Salus est quidquam extra legem et alienum a lege. Comp. the Antinomian theses of Anthony of Nordhausen: e. g. "The Christian's best wisdom is to know nothing of the law—Moses knew nothing at all of our faith and of our religion—the law does not belong to the church, but to courts and not to pulpits. The law was not given to Christians so that they should neither be punished nor frightened by it—the law, good works, new obedience do not belong to the kingdom of Christ; but to the world, like Moses and the Pope's dominion

Satan would sweep away Christ, Repentance, Sin and the entire Scriptures, yea, even the Author of the Scriptures, God himself, and expect to introduce the most destructive security, contempt of God, unpunished audacity and impenitence.—The more clearly and minutely the Lutheran church embraced the doctrine of justification, the more decidedly it asserted the insufficiency of the law for salvation and the more boldly it rejected all works, in so far as they were proposed as a condition of salvation, so much the more was it necessary that they should support the divine authority of the law and show its relation to Christian faith and life. Neglecting this, there was a danger of losing on the side of a false liberty, what had been gained on the other. It was a great service rendered by Luther, that with an energy peculiar to himself, he prevented this in the disputation mentioned. He explained how the law was precluded from the work of justification, had indeed nothing to do with it; but it by no means followed that it should not be preached, but on the contrary in a three fold point of view was indispensable, first as an outward discipline, as a safeguard against gross outbreaks of sin; then for the impenitent that they may leave their unrighteousness and condemnation and humbled may seek the peace of God; finally for believers, for in so far as the old man is not fully destroyed, the new man has just started, and in so far as the flesh lives aside of the Spirit of Christ, do they need the continued reproof of the law; and the law must be preached both to saints and to sinners; to the latter, that alarmed, they may learn their sins, their exposure to death and the wrath of God, and thereby be humbled; to the former that they may be admonished to crucify and mortify their flesh, together with the affections and lusts, in order to avoid security; for this takes away both faith and the fear of God, and causes that the last state is worse than the first. (Disput. 5: 42–45.) More indeed — “for as the law was before Christ and condemned us under him, but was silenced and satisfied by the forgiveness of sins and is hereafter to be fulfilled by the Spirit, so it will after Christ be fulfilled in a future life, when at last the creature, as the law requires, becomes entirely new; therefore the law will never be abolished, but remains either to be fulfilled by the damned or ful-

—no man can be saved when the *tertius usus* of the law is true and to be taught in the churches—a believing christian is above all law obedience—believers in Christ, or those that have been born again are deified, are God himself and cannot sin—God has not given you his word that you might be saved by it.” &c. S. Acts and proceedings of the Alb. Colloq. (1568); Wittenberg, 1570. p. 207, 208.

filled in the saved." (II. 45-47.) Thus Luther — comp. Walch, 20, 20. 37 ff.

Did not the Lutheran church pursue the right course in condemning this Antinomianism? Did it not protect its dogma in regard to justification and the Christian freedom involved in it against an imminent and great perversion, in arraying against it the admirable article in regard to the triple use of the law, in which the substance of Luther's positions was embodied? Does not the still prevailing abuse of Evangelical freedom show the necessity of the scriptural definition: the law is the rule and directory, to which the life of the pious is to be conformed: *lex est regula ac norma, ad quam vita pii est instituenda*?

But this is the doctrine of the formula that has been least opposed. *b.* We will now proceed to *Osiandris*m. (On Osiander compare Wilke, Andr. Osiander's life, doctrine and writings, Stralsund 1844. First part extends only till the year 1530.)

The peculiar view which Andrew Osiander broached in regard to justification, in opposition to the church view, was by many considered, unjustly, as a return to Catholicism. That man was justified by the righteousness of Christ and by faith alone and not by his own works, he did not deny. But justification itself, he did not ground on the atonement, but on the essential righteousness, that is, on the divine nature of the propitiator, and considered its essence as consisting not in imputation of the objective merits of Christ, but in the influx (*Immanenz*) of the actual righteousness of Christ, that is, his divine essence in the believer (*justitia essentialis, essentia divina, divina natura*). Assuredly, this divine taught, did Christ the God man by his life, sufferings, and death (passive and active obedience,) satisfy God for us and purchase redemption, that is the forgiveness of sins; and this is a pure objective act which took place between God and Christ, and had as its objective result the atonement. Every one has part in this, so far as he is by baptism introduced into the fellowship of the mystical body of Christ (his church,) entirely apart from his subjective condition, his appropriation of it by faith: "It is as if an African was freed from bondage, his posterity would be free with him." (Compare Andr. Osiander's Confession in regard to the only Mediator Jesus and his justification. Königsb. 1551. Fol. B. 2.) But this redemption is not by any means our justification. We are righteous not by Christ for us, but by Christ in us, viz.: by this, that his divine essence dwells in us, after we have become members of his body and

Satan would sweep away Christ, Repentance, Sin and the entire Scriptures, yea, even the Author of the Scriptures, God himself, and expect to introduce the most destructive security, contempt of God, unpunished audacity and impenitence.—The more clearly and minutely the Lutheran church embraced the doctrine of justification, the more decidedly it asserted the insufficiency of the law for salvation and the more boldly it rejected all works, in so far as they were proposed as a condition of salvation, so much the more was it necessary that they should support the divine authority of the law and show its relation to Christian faith and life. Neglecting this, there was a danger of losing on the side of a false liberty, what had been gained on the other. It was a great service rendered by Luther, that with an energy peculiar to himself, he prevented this in the disputation mentioned. He explained how the law was precluded from the work of justification, had indeed nothing to do with it; but it by no means followed that it should not be preached, but on the contrary in a three fold point of view was indispensable, first as an outward discipline, as a safeguard against gross outbreaks of sin; then for the impenitent that they may leave their unrighteousness and condemnation and humbled may seek the peace of God; finally for believers, for in so far as the old man is not fully destroyed, the new man has just started, and in so far as the flesh lives aside of the Spirit of Christ, do they need the continued reproof of the law; and the law must be preached both to saints and to sinners; to the latter, that alarmed, they may learn their sins, their exposure to death and the wrath of God, and thereby be humbled; to the former that they may be admonished to crucify and mortify their flesh, together with the affections and lusts, in order to avoid security; for this takes away both faith and the fear of God, and causes that the last state is worse than the first. (Disput. 5: 42–45.) More indeed—"for as the law was before Christ and condemned us under him, but was silenced and satisfied by the forgiveness of sins and is hereafter to be fulfilled by the Spirit, so it will after Christ be fulfilled in a future life, when at last the creature, as the law requires, becomes entirely new; therefore the law will never be abolished, but remains either to be fulfilled by the damned or ful-

—no man can be saved when the *tertius usus* of the law is true and to be taught in the churches—a believing christian is above all law obedience—believers in Christ, or those that have been born again are deified, are God himself and cannot sin—God has not given you his word that you might be saved by it." &c. S. Acts and proceedings of the Alb. Colloq. (1568); Wittenberg, 1570. p. 207, 208.

filled in the saved." (II. 45-47.) Thus Luther — comp. Walch, 20, 20. 37 ff.

Did not the Lutheran church pursue the right course in condemning this Antinomianism? Did it not protect its dogma in regard to justification and the Christian freedom involved in it against an imminent and great perversion, in arraying against it the admirable article in regard to the triple use of the law, in which the substance of Luther's positions was embodied? Does not the still prevailing abuse of Evangelical freedom show the necessity of the scriptural definition: the law is the rule and directory, to which the life of the pious is to be conformed: *lex est regula ac norma, ad quam vita pii est instituenda*?

But this is the doctrine of the formula that has been least opposed. *b.* We will now proceed to *Osiandricism*. (On Osiander compare Wilke, Andr. Osiander's life, doctrine and writings, Stralsund 1844. First part extends only till the year 1530.)

The peculiar view which Andrew Osiander broached in regard to justification, in opposition to the church view, was by many considered, unjustly, as a return to Catholicism. That man was justified by the righteousness of Christ and by faith alone and not by his own works, he did not deny. But justification itself, he did not ground on the atonement, but on the essential righteousness, that is, on the divine nature of the propitiator, and considered its essence as consisting not in imputation of the objective merits of Christ, but in the influx (*Immanenz*) of the actual righteousness of Christ, that is, his divine essence in the believer (*justitia essentialis, essentia divina, divina natura*). Assuredly, this divine taught, did Christ the God man by his life, sufferings, and death (passive and active obedience,) satisfy God for us and purchase redemption, that is the forgiveness of sins; and this is a pure objective act which took place between God and Christ, and had as its objective result the atonement. Every one has part in this, so far as he is by baptism introduced into the fellowship of the mystical body of Christ (his church,) entirely apart from his subjective condition, his appropriation of it by faith: "It is as if an African was freed from bondage, his posterity would be free with him." (Compare Andr. Osiander's Confession in regard to the only Mediator Jesus and his justification. Königsb. 1551. Fol. B. 2.) But this redemption is not by any means our justification. We are righteous not by Christ for us, but by Christ in us, viz.: by this, that his divine essence dwells in us, after we have become members of his body and

have received the pardon of our sins, and this takes place when we receive in faith and with the Eternal Word, (which is only an outward sound) the Gospel, which God has proclaimed to us on account of that objective redemption and the indwelling actual word, which is in the outward, and is the *logos* himself.¹

We are righteous on account of the indwelling of this word, or what is the same, on account of the actual righteousness of the divinity of Christ which dwells in us; not on account of the act of the atonement, not on account of his obedience in his state of humiliation (*obedientia qua legem implevit*), for all this as having transpired long ago cannot justify those who live now, *justos facere*. Not an imputed righteousness (*justitia imputata*), which would in itself be a contradiction, as God could not pronounce and consider, an actual sinner, a righteous person, without a false judgment; but that divine righteousness received by faith, that inhabitation of the God-head renders righteous.² This God imputes to the believer, on its account he has pleasure in him, and here both meet, making and declaring righteous (which by the doctrine of the church is wrongly explained and separated). For this imparted divine righteousness is a new light and life in men, destroys sin, which has already been forgiven, but still dwells in the flesh, and justifies him actually and truly.

¹ Osiander notices frequently that this reception of the divinity of Christ is through his humanity. *Larg. Conf. D. 3. 6.* What he understands by this, may be best seen by his treatise against Melancthon *Bg. E. u. I.*; but this does not change the matter; justification is constantly based upon the inhabitation of the divine nature.

² *Comp. Grosses Bekenntniss, F. 3.* As the Gospel brings to us the word of God which is God himself and by faith into our heart, soul and spirit, so that we are awakened by it, it likewise displays its power further and justifies us, that is, it makes us righteous in the same degree in which it gives us life; for Paul says in *Gal. 3.*: for if there had been a law given which could have given life, verily righteousness should have been by the law; and powerfully shows with such words, that nothing can justify us, that does not impart life, and whatever imparts life (be it the law or what it may) that justifies us too. Now it is certain that since we are dead in trespasses and sins (*Ephes. 2: 1*) there is nothing that can quicken us, except the word of God, Jesus Christ, who was both God and man. From this it follows irresistibly, that nothing can justify or make us righteous, but the very same word of God, which is God himself and our life and righteousness, namely, Jesus Christ, our Lord, as Paul writes *1 Cor. 1.* On the meaning of the word righteousness, *Fol. H. 2*—According to this it is frequently and nearly through the entire Scriptures, taken for piety. That in this piety, every other virtue is embraced and intended, and in this way we employ it here, when we speak of the righteousness of faith. And if any one would ask what this righteousness and piety are, I answer, righteousness is just that which moves the righteous to do right, and without which he can neither be righteous, nor do right.

For this very reason God considers him righteous, and his judgment is true; the fruit of such a justification is the renewal of man, obedience and good works.¹

This peculiar view of justification excited, as is well known, the greatest attention. The whole Lutheran church arose against it as one man, and attacked it as a perversion of its richest treasure; for as such was the doctrine of Osiander characterized by all the faculties of Theology, ministeriums and individual scholars, whose numerous decisions and responses are yet extant. That it was a cardinal doctrine that was in dispute, *caput et arx doctrinae Christianae*, was the general opinion; even the mild Melancthon expressed himself to this effect. The starting point of the doctrine of Osiander is an attack upon an external conception of faith; in opposition to this, he asserted that faith produced an actual apprehension, a living union with Christ, and only so far as it did this, justified, and this he exhibited in the most striking manner, with great knowledge of the word of God, more clearly and appositely,

G. 3. Here is now my sincere, correct and clear answer, that Christ, according to his divine nature, is our righteousness, and not according to his human nature, although we cannot find or obtain such a divine righteousness beyond the circle of his humanity, but when by faith he dwells in us, he brings his righteousness, which is his divine nature, into us, which is imputed to us, as if it belonged to us. It is, indeed, given to us and flows from his humanity as the head, into us as his members, and moves us to yield our members as instruments of righteousness to God, as Paul directs in Rom. 6.

O. 3. Christ is our wisdom and righteousness not in virtue of his human but his divine nature. The proof is particularly found in Jeremiah 9, צדקת ייחיה Compare the argument against the church doctrine Fol. G. 4. On the relation of justification to redemption Bl. B. Through the redemption of Christ did he purchase us this, that God will, through faith, grant us the divine righteousness of Christ, Ps. 32. But Christ's merits in life, suffering and death is not this righteousness. Compare the Confutation of Melancthon's reply: L. 2. This, I say, is our righteousness, when we are incorporated by faith into Christ, his members and become partakers of his divine nature, as often stated, then is his divine nature our righteousness, and this it is alone and will not admit of any addition, for where God the Father, Son and Holy Ghost are, there is endless life, righteousness and glory. This righteousness has been purchased and merited for us by Christ, and must, as it had been lost in Adam, be purchased and merited again by Christ; but this merit obtained through righteousness, cannot be the righteousness itself. It is, after the divine righteousness dwells in us, that the redemption benefits us and forgiveness is realized. a. a. O. T.

¹ In this Osiander is not entirely consistent, in that in the larger Conf. he regards the effect of the indwelling righteousness of Christ upon man, as conducive to his justification, in the refutation of Melancthon he distinguishes expressly between the two, and repeatedly declares, that the essential righteousness (*justitia essentialis*) in itself, so far as it dwells in us, is our righteousness. Bg. J. and this I regard as his real view, the more as the expression used in the Conf. several times: Righteousness is this, that which makes us do right, he here takes back, and explains in the manner specified.

than many of his cotemporaries; but when he assumed that this was his view and not that of the church, Luther's doctrine concerning faith, and not that which prevailed, this was gross injustice, which tended to much perplexity. Much more objectionable appeared his opinion in regard to justification.—The opposition against the declaratory meaning of the word, the transposition of the church's explanation *justum pronunciare in justum facere* contains an approach to the Catholic doctrine, and although the greater part of his opponents were candid enough not to accuse him of retrocession to Catholicism, they properly object that his expressions are, in any event, even admitting that they have a better sense, perplexing, and well calculated to throw a shade on the Protestant fundamental doctrine, together with the Augustana;¹ further his definition of *justificare* contradicts the Scripture, whilst that of the church has its sanction. But the point under consideration is not merely a point of grammar, but a fundamental difference in the matter itself. Whilst the Scriptures, and with them the church, place justification in the closest connexion with forgiveness of sin, and identify this with that, or consider it as an essential element, Osiander detaches the forgiveness of sin entirely from it, and gives it another location. Whilst further, it brings justification into the closest relation to the fact of redemption, to the sacrifice that the God-man made on the cross, and regards it as the application of his merits, as the appropriation of his obedience manifested in life and death, Osiander destroyed this interior, necessary union, and destroyed the essence of justification, by separating it from its objective ground. By this too, he at the same time, subverted the relation in which it stood to the law, which was fulfilled for us by Christ in his life and death, and in addition, denied the proper connection between the law and the Gospel. Just here may be found the fundamental errors of his system.²

¹ Flacius Verlegung des Bekenntniss, Fol. N. 3. "And the view of Osiander will make the Papists impudent, not merely because he makes the Augsburg Confession notorious in all our churches, as if it erred in the prominent article concerning justification, but because he speaks, in the way that they do, in regard to the word *justificare*."

² Comp. the reply of the Hamb. and Lüneb. church. Fol. C. 3. "Negat quidem Osiander, se humanam Christi naturam separare et excludere—et tamen obedientiae et passioni ejus adimit justificationem." Flacius Loc. Cit. D. "Osiander cuts the office of Christ too close, in so much separating atonement and justification. The Scriptures show that the sacrifice of Christ occupies a constant place as a Mediator between us and God, through which we have access to the Father, and receive everything good from him." Just. Menius in his work on righteousness, which is accepted of God, against Osiander G. 4. "Therefore Osiander greatly errs—first, in regard to the of-

What he substituted for justification in the sense of the church, the inhabitation of the divine nature, the divinity of the Son, that is the consequence of justification; but does not take place as Osiander supposed; for although the spirit of Christ does dwell in the justified and regenerated, this subjective indwelling is not a perfect, but a commencing, increasing communion, and its operation in men, righteousness of life, is only a feeble beginning, a *justitia inchoata*, on which it is impossible to found justification before a holy God, who requires a perfect satisfaction and a perfect fulfilling of the law or righteousness.¹ Osiander then does two things; he perverts the entire order² of salvation, and takes all true consolation from

fice and work of the Mediator, that he tears from one another, as if they had no connection, atonement, redemption, forgiveness and justification, which are nevertheless so united, that where one is, there the others must be—one flows from the other, as they are such treasures of grace as the Savior, once for all, by one work, purchased for us, (viz: by his obedience in life and death) and thus Osiander separates justification from the life and death of Christ, which is nevertheless our righteousness; and thus the divine nature from the human."

Flacius Loc. Cit. Vorw. It might be thought that this error of Osiander was of no consequence, as he brings us directly into treaty with God, without a mediator. But we must have access to God through Righteousness, and treat with him as our father, for he can only receive him as a child, who has righteousness. This, our righteousness, is the obedience of Christ, which he has rendered the law for us; the same treasure imputed to us by Christ, is an instrument and mediator, by which we obtain everything good from God, therefore, whosoever rejects these, but proposes to stand before God and to be righteous as he is in himself—as Osiander says, "the eternal essence of God is our righteousness;" he treats with God without a mediator, and an instrumentality. The same G. 4. If the Son was given us by the Father, and we could become righteous by his essential righteousness, we might have become righteous without the incarnation of Christ, without the obedience of Christ's sufferings." In regard to the difficulty of Osiander, mentioned before, that we were not in being whilst Christ lived, Flacius says, F. O.—"Answer, Christ was slain from the foundation of the world; therefore is he slain at the end, and to-day and yesterday, that is: the merit of his obedience and sufferings endures, and will endure from beginning to end, although it was finished in a few hours." In the same way the Hamburgers. Resp. E.

¹ Resp. Hamb. et Luneb. H. Docemus—hanc justitiam (sc. vivificationem et sanctificationem) fide in omnibus credentibus excitari et in interno homine vires suas exserere: sed haec justitia cum sit tantum inchoata et semper imperfecta maneat, negamus ea nos justos esse coram Deo, et quod possit liberare a justa Dei ira, peccato, morte. So Flacius Loc. Cit. M. The inhabitation of God in us is not justification, but its effect, its reward—is not perfect, and cannot, therefore, justify us before God; perfect will it be in eternity, where the highest union with God takes place.

² Resp. Hamb. et Luneb. J. Prorsus Dei ordo invertitur, posterius priore, prius posteriore loco ponitur; ex effectis et donis conjunctis cum justificatione facit causam efficientem. In the decision of the Court Saxon Theologians, is explicitly shown, that atonement and redemption precede justification, the indwelling of God follows—then it is said—Osiander acts like a driver who puts the cart before the horse.

man, inasmuch as he teaches him, instead of trusting in the Christ out of us and for us, instead of the merits of his sufferings and death, to trust in his inhabitation and operation in us, and to regard this as the state of grace; moreover he came at last to the Catholic doctrine of works, asserting: "Righteousness is that which makes us do right," and by this he weakens either the knowledge of sin which still cleaves to the regenerate and the consciousness of guilt, or he leads the awakened conscience to despair. Just on this practical, truly Protestant argument, the opponents of Osiander lay the greatest stress.¹

On the other hand, we add, Osiander makes subjective renewal and holiness, on which he lays so much stress, impossible; for this grows only out of the merits of Christ appropriated by faith, out of the merits of his sufferings and his obedience; if then, the proper object of faith, the forgiveness of sins purchased by Christ, is removed, it cuts off the life root from that.

But Osiander taught forgiveness, procured by the vicarious obedience of Christ; (see above) and it might appear² as if this accorded with what the church taught in regard to justification, only under another name and in another place. But, it was said in reply, the two were very far apart; for what Osiander called forgiveness, was a something done once for all, that had nothing to do with faith and justification.³ It hap-

¹Fürstlich Sächsische Censur. I. E. There are in this doctrine two powerful obstructions, which lie in the way of the sinner's conscience. The one is, that all men, not excepting the most holy children of God, constantly experience and feel the power of sin more powerfully in themselves, than the new obedience of righteousness, therefore, they are so frequently distressed and unhappy. How could such a sinner's conscience derive consolation from the doctrine of Osiander, which says, "God is not willing to pronounce any man righteous, unless he is so in deed and truth (by his own indwelling); yea, how is it possible, that the poor sinner's conscience should not be agonized and rendered desperate by such a doctrine? Ebend. Cens. III. M. Our only comfort is, that a foreign righteousness is imputed to us. Comp. Flacius. Loc. Cit. This opinion is not only unscriptural, but likewise injurious to the conscience. For some presumptuous spirits, experiencing a little of the new birth, will presently think themselves demigods. On the other hand, others who are hampered by temptation and doubts, feeling no virtue of the new life in them, will despair; for this doctrine teaches us to rely directly on the new birth, and to trust in the infused righteousness of God. On the other hand, Paul, although he was not conscious to himself of anything wicked, said nevertheless, he was not thereby justified, and considered his righteousness filth, that he might have Christ's righteousness, and thus discriminate the righteousness of regeneration from imputed righteousness.

²This appearance led Plank into the error of believing that the whole controversy was merely a war of words.

³He certainly designed by this, more directly to assert the objectivity of the atonement, in order to separate justification from it as a subjective occur-

pened to man without intervention of the word, without an active appropriation on his part, as likewise without an offer on the part of God, of its own accord, in an inexplicable way, and appeared, moreover, immediately in power through the indwelling of God; till then it left man under the wrath of God and in sins, and was so in itself a mere nothing, and entirely inoperative. The forgiveness of sin properly, and reception into divine favor, took place further, always in virtue of that immanence of the actual righteousness or divine nature of Christ, which Osiander called justification, not by the imputation of the righteousness which he as God-man, by fulfilling the law, rendered for us, and thus, on this side, his system led to the confounding of righteousness, regeneration and renewing, on the due discrimination of which the order of salvation rests.

These are the leading objections adduced against the doctrine of the celebrated theologian of Königsberg. They show very clearly the utter irreconcilability of it with the Protestant fundamental principle. If this was to be supported, those positions, and particularly the following, must be condemned. 1.) That Christ is our righteousness only in his divine nature; 2.) That justification means, to make righteous by the inhabitation of the divinity; 3.) That justifying faith has its object, not in the vicarious obedience of Jesus Christ, but in the actual righteousness dwelling and operating in men. Entirely the same is true, beyond doubt, of the theory of Stankarus, which founds justification entirely on the vicarious obedience of Christ, performed by him as man; an attempt weak in itself, which in an obscure form conceals indeed a better sense, but as the other extreme of the Osiandrian error, particularly in the objectionable formula, that Christ is our righteousness only in his divine nature, must likewise be discarded. No one will surely deny, that the Lutheran church in the unanimous rejection of both these errors, gave efficiency to its principle.—The positive, which it had to offer, could be nothing, but the most accurate determination of the idea of justification and its connection with the redeeming activity of the God-man. This is done by the Formula of Concord (Art. 3. Comp. Epit. 3.) with the explanation, that the ground of our justification, *totius personae Christi tota obedientia*, more particularly, the obedience is, what Christ in the unity of his person, conse-

rence; but in this way, on the other hand, he identified the atonement and its effects, forgiveness, in an erroneous way.

quently in the two inseparable parts of his nature (*secundum utramque personam*) rendered as God-man, and with which, in our stead he fulfilled the divine law. This obedience is not restricted to suffering (*obedientia passiva*;) but as the divine will, revealed in the law, embraces the entire life of man, and not merely condemnation, but likewise demands positive holiness, so the obedience of Christ embraces both; it is not only endurance of suffering, but likewise obedience to the law, and only in this way, by rendering satisfaction to the entire will of God, became truly propitiatory. This very obedience was imputed to the believer for righteousness, C. p. 685, 696.—(non ea tantum, qua patri paruit in tota sua passione et morte, verum etiam qua nostra sponte sese legi subiecit eamque obedientia illa sua implevit,) the force of these distinctions lies in this, that they refer the objective ground of our justification to the redeeming activity of the God-man, and are consequently merely a recognition of the fundamental principle of the church. The extension of the obedience to the entire actions and life of the Redeemer, is the result, partly of the doctrine concerning the extent of the law, as it is unfolded in the Apology, partly of the view, that, if Christ is a Redeemer in his entire person, his entire agency on earth must have a vicarious import; because both person and work are inseparable. Although this may not be so clearly declared in the older confessions, it is nevertheless involved in these, and coincides very closely with the views of Luther. Long before the Formula Concordiae, it was the general conviction, and it was only necessary for it to give fixedness to an established *consensus*.—Nevertheless, it was done in such a manner as to be no impediment to future development. Again, the difference between justification and renewing, as well as the intimate connection between both, was placed once more in its proper position, in opposition to the view of Osiander. And when, accordingly, the Formul. Conc. Loc. Cit. explains, if the article of justification is purely maintained, neither what precedes nor follows it can be confounded with it—when, on the one hand it asserts that the inhabitation of the divinity in man is not the *justitia Dei*, on account of which we are pronounced righteous before God, on the other hand, that it follows the preceding righteousness of faith; when it on the one hand asserts, “that the renewing, the commencing righteousness of life, love, new obedience positively do not belong to this article,” it on the other hand most unequivocally declares, that all this must spring from justification as fruit, and emphatically adds: *haec non ita divelluntur, quasi vera fides aliquando et aliquamdiu stare*

possit cum malo proposito, sed ordine causarum et effectuum, antecedentium et consequentiam ita distribuitur:" it has merely repeated correctly the contents of the sixth and twentieth Article of the Augustana, as likewise of the third of the Apology, in addition by the last cited definition guarded it, in the best way against a misapprehension, and very felicitously explained the intimate connection of justification and renewing. In the declaration that the inhabitation of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost is conditioned by faith, is by no means denied, that the Holy Ghost was active before, in the human heart, and produced both repentance and faith (*primum in conversione per spiritum s. fides accenditur*) but merely, that that more complete communion with God does not lay the foundation of justification, as Osiander contended, and so far from doing this, it could only occur in connexion with it. For "forgiveness of sin and the gracious reception of the sinner for Christ's sake," make man first an object of divine favor, and place him in a relation to God, in consequence of which he becomes capable of his real, full and constant indwelling. And thus is this definition only another expression for the Protestant doctrine of the relation of justification to renovation. The other points, which were introduced into this controversy, particularly in regard to the inward and outward word, belong to a general tendency, to which we proceed. c. This is the mystic, or as it was then designated, the enthusiastic. The peculiarity of this widely diffused system consisted in the depreciation of the external in comparison with the internal, the visible, outward means of grace in opposition to the internally working spirit. It disengaged the agency of the last from the instrumentality of the first, and thus fell into an erroneous spiritualism, which communicated itself to the representations of all other doctrines, particularly the doctrine of the word and the Sacraments, likewise the doctrines of justification, the person of the Redeemer, and the church.

In reference to all these points, it brought the charge of externalness (objectivity) against the church, whilst it passed over into a one-sided (subjectivity) *innerness*. We meet with it in the earlier periods of the Reformation, especially in those enthusiasts who caused, in 1521, so much excitement in Wittenberg. Agricola, as early as the year 1519, had expressed himself in regard to the entire Scriptures, in a manner similar to that in regard to the law; now he writes, "outward things are of no use; the external word is not sufficient for the proper illumination and comfort of souls; anon he starts doubts in regard to infant baptism, and denies the real reception of the

body and blood of Christ in the Eucharist. His flesh can only be spiritually received."¹

How much further the Zwickauer went is known; likewise how these theories became associated with politics in the case of the Anabaptists;² we restrict ourselves to the theological discussion. This is most fully presented in the statements of a certain Jacob Kautus, which he published in 1527 at Worms. No external word, or sign, or sacrament; further, no external promise has the power, that it can strengthen or comfort the inner man; more strongly the assertion of Thomas Münzer: "The spirit testifies that all the books of the Old and New Testament should be laid aside, and the revelations of the heart should be followed;" the rejection of infant baptism and the spiritual view of the Lord's Supper, would of course be associated with this.³

Oecolampadius expresses himself substantially in the same way, but with more caution, in the controversial document against the Swabia Sungramma⁴ and was resisted by Luther with all his energy, and rejected in the Schmalkald articles.

¹ Corpus. Reformat, 1, 536. Arnold, Kirch. and K. Hist. 2, 532 ff. Ranke, deutsche Geschichte im Zeitalter der Reform, 2, 19.

² Ranke 3, 91. Vgl. Luther's declaration: "They wish to convert God's word from corporeal to spiritual, and thereby turn themselves from spiritual to carnal."

³ Arnold a. a. O. 860, 863, and in the Appendix to part II, where there are copious extracts from Anabaptist and fanatical writings.

⁴ "Christ," says Oecolampadius, "has given to the outward word no such power, that it should contain his body and bring it into us actually . . . it is otherwise not in the nature of words, that they convey the meaning of things, which had previously obtained in the human mind, an internal conception or word; for what the outward word has more than the sound, it has from the internal mind, and from the interior word. In the same mode the body would actually be in the inner words, or the soul of man, which inner words are more valuable than the outward. True, the device was adopted, that the words "this is my body," are not historical; for then it would not concern us. But if there be in the words a command and an ordinance of God, let the word of the command be shown. And where there is the appearance of a commanding word, where is the ordinance for the future, that so it must be, as is said in the Prophecies? Therefore, in whatever way the words are turned and placed, they exhibit that they are explanatory words of ceremony at that time instituted by the Lord. How dare we ascribe that to the outward word, that the divine word has incorporated in the external (i. e. that God has united with the outward word the power of his creating word and life?) so even the apostles wished to be considered as nothing, for though planting and watering, they were nothing, but God, who gave the increase. And so it is. In the Scriptures there is nothing about the incorporation with the word (Inwohnung.) I know that the apostles declare every thing in their words; But that the things pass to believers in the words, I cannot admit; for the glory is God's. They suppose the spirit is in the words and cannot be separated from them. O, if that were so, no instruction would be fruitless; the spirit would not be idle. But the internal, constant word, and the external, are as far apart as the law and grace. Now grace is not enclosed in the

But after his death it reasserted itself in many forms. In Osiander as a distinction of the inner and outer word, in which that was brought on, as if in a carriage; the internal is the actual thought of God, the Logos, the Son, the outward the manifestation of the inward, a mere sound, that strikes the ear and then vanishes (Gross. Bek. Bl. F. B.)

In Caspar Schwenkfeld it was most matured, who very nearly resembled Osiander in regard to justification. The outer word is to him a mere sign of the internal; a testimony of the real life. From the external word comes an external faith on God and Christ, but from the internal a living faith, whereby alone we have intercourse with God in Christ, and know and receive in the heart his divine grace. This inner word is Christ himself; the actual substantial Creative Word; which alone quickens and saves, purifies, enlightens, and nourishes without any external means, instruments and helps. In regard to the Scriptures he says therefore: it extends only to the outer man, and there must be faith, spiritual understanding and an open mind in him, given by God to the elect, that the Scriptures may be profitable to them." In applying this theory to the Sacrament, Schwenkfeld further teaches, that the water in baptism was not the medium for the transmission of the Holy Spirit, but a mere sign of spiritual baptism; on which account infant baptism and the sacrament of water baptism had with him very little value. Consistently with this he teaches further that in the Lord's Supper, the reception of Christ's flesh is not connected with the earthly elements nor imparted by them, but solely by faith; for which reason he ascribes to the bread and wine in the Eucharist merely symbolical significance. Here his peculiar doctrine in regard to the glorified humanity of Christ comes in, or rather, it lies at the foundation of the whole. The doctrine is, that the flesh of Christ born of God (by the incarnation) is actually deified by death, ascension and heavenly coronation, is one with the essence of God and has become what God is, the flesh and blood of God: A *communicatio idiomatum* (com-

law, and as there is spoken, by outward words, so may ceremonies, pictures and sacraments be spoken of. Though indeed the word is more powerful as it is nearer the internal word. Nevertheless, altogether they may not teach anything, to say nothing about doing anything greater. But explanation, exhortation, and reminding is their office. The external word does not give faith; it does not comfort, it does not honor, it does not enlighten; but our inner, secret, heavenly teacher is Christ. . . . Thus, words are, properly speaking, only monitory signs, which stimulate us to seek the things in ourselves, and thus are intimated through the words, not that we may learn the one through the other, but that we say seek the truth in ourselves and thus be taught. Comp. Luther's works, so Walch 20, 770, 772, ff.

pare below) as taught by the Lutheran church, he considered too objective; he contended for a substantial unity of the divine and human nature, a proper deification of the flesh.

And this theory constituted the centre of his system; and upon the communication of this flesh to man the essence of justification, of regeneration, of sanctification, and glorification, depended; the essence of the Sacraments depended upon its inward enjoyment, which, as outward acts and signs are mere emblems of that internal enjoyment is independent of them and depending entirely upon faith.

This theory of Schwenkfeld, which we will not unfold in this place, further, does not stand isolated; it is worthy the characteristic form of a widely spread tendency, which stood in decided opposition to the Lutheran church, and rejected and controverted its doctrines in regard to justification, the word, and Sacrament, the person of Christ, the church and the office of the word, doctrines, against which it had spoken in the most decided manner in the older confessions. (On the person Christ, afterwards.)

What could the Formula Concordiae do less than simply reject these theories, which had in warning examples shown their dangerous consequences, and in opposition to them make known the indwelling of the Holy Ghost in the word, the objectivity of the Sacraments, or in addition repeat what was contained in the old Confession? Comp. Art. 12. Should it relinquish *fundamentum illud religionis nostrae, spiritum sanctum cum verbo praedicato, audito et diligenter conservato praesentem atque efficacem esse*, the ancient solid canon: *Deus interna non dat, nisi per externa*. Well has it done in preserving this; we feel grateful to this day for it!

It has, at all events, sustained the connection with its fundamental principle in opposition to the Antinomian, Osian-drian and mystical tendency; and what of new it has presented is nothing more than a more full explanation and deduction from the old. Thus far no reproach lies against it

ARTICLE IV.

THE TRANSFIGURATION.

By Rev. C. Porterfield Krauth, A. M., Winchester, Va.

THE most stupendous events our world has ever witnessed have occurred on mountains. The three grandest and greatest revelations of Jehovah's person and counsels were made on Sinai, Tabor and Calvary: the proclamation of the law, the Transfiguration of the Messiah, and his agonizing death. They are spots easily marked; they seem to be separate in a manner from the world; they conduct the mind by a natural analogy toward the heaven to which they point, and they remain eternal monuments erected by the prophetic hand of God previous to the events with which they became associated by indissoluble ties.¹

Let us ascend that mountain more glorious than Sinai, and yielding only to Calvary in the sacred power of touching the believer's heart. From it has been gleaming down our Savior's lustre through the long night of ages. He has risen from the dead, and the injunction of secrecy has been long withdrawn. Where only the favored three once stood, we can now all stand and behold Christ in the glory of his Father. As it was in prayer he underwent this change, we have the assurance as members of his body, that if we draw near in the same spirit of supplication, we shall not only witness his transfiguration, but shall be sharers in it; we shall be conformed to his likeness, beholding 'the glory of the Lord, we shall be changed into the same image from glory to glory, even as by the Spirit of the Lord.' (2 Cor. 3. 8).²

¹ No one has read the Bible attentively without marking the correspondence between the moral character of its events, and the scenes of external nature in which they occurred; Adam in innocence in the garden, Jacob wrestling by night, Moses in the desert, the earthquake and fire preceding the still small voice, Christ weeping at Kedron and ascending at Bethany; all these show to us that external nature has been adapted to the moral constitution of rational beings, that the love of beauty is a divine element, and that poetry in its true province springs from the highest reason. There are cases in which one poetical argument would transcend in real weight a thousand logical ones.

² "We should remember that these things occurred not only on account of those present, but the whole church should regard herself as a spectator of them. Tu ipse hæc cogitans . . . stas in hoc monte, et oculis et auribus, et mente accipis hæc manifesta Testimonia."

Melanchthon. Conciones in Matth.

Works, (Wittenberg, 1563.) vol. iii. 484.

But "SIX DAYS"¹ had passed since the Redeemer had declared, that of those, who then surrounded him, some should not taste of death until they saw the Son coming "with power" in his kingdom. From the care with which the Evangelists, who so often neglect the chronological order of events, associate this scene with those words, we can hardly doubt that they stand in intimate relation; an opinion which seems to be placed almost beyond doubt by the language of Peter, (2 Pet. 1: 16, 17.): "We have not followed cunningly devised fables, when we made known unto you the *power* and *coming* of our Lord Jesus Christ, but were eye-witnesses of his *majesty* for he received from God the Father *honor and glory*" &c. "in the holy mount." Not indeed that our Saviour's words were then entirely fulfilled, but they were in part defined, in part consummated and an earnest given of the fulfilment of all the rest. It was a pledge of the reality of his highest claims, and a transient foretaste of the most magnificent and abiding developments of his mediatorial reign.

"Jesus taketh Peter, and James, and John his brother."

It is impossible, unless we read the Gospel most carelessly, to avoid noticing, that there was a distinction between the apostles of our Lord as to the position they occupied in his confidence and affection. Though he loved all, and trusted in all, except Judas, (and perhaps even in him for a time), his apostles yet shone around him with varied lustre, "as star differs from star in glory." Peter, James and John, were preëminently favored. They alone attended him when the daughter of Jairus was raised: they alone were present with him at Gethsemane: John's love burned with a pure and steady flame; he lay upon the bosom of his Lord, the loving and "beloved disciple;" and Peter had witnessed a good confession, and the subsequent history of James shows, that he had a heroic spirit:² so that we may look upon these privileges as tokens of honor; although special opportunities are often allowed by God as a concession to peculiar infirmities, and be-

¹ Luke says "about eight days after." He speaks inclusively, the other two Evangelists exclusively.

² "His martyrdom (Acts 12: 1, 2.) took place first among those of the Apostles, cir. A. D. 42 or 44. Clemens Alexandrinus states that the man who brought James before the Judges was so effected with his constancy in confessing Christ, that he declared himself to be a Christian, and was condemned as well as the Apostle to be beheaded." He implored his pardon as they went to the place of execution, which the Apostle gave in the words: Peace be to thee, and sealed with a kiss. Euseb. Hist. Eccles. ii. 9. Compare Luke 5: 10. Mark 13: 3. Froben, Basil. 1557.

come thus an evidence of the sinfulness and weakness of those to whom they are given.

"And bringeth them up, leadeth them up, into an high mountain apart by themselves."

The prevailing sentiment has been that this mountain was Tabor.¹ No site more appropriate to the scene could have been chosen. This mount was already distinguished in sacred story. It is represented by travellers as one of the most beautiful localities in the Holy Land. To the north-west, through a bend in the hills, are seen the blue waters of the Mediterranean Sea, to the south lies Hermon, whose soft dews have been sung by the Psalmist, and between the two mountains may be traced the brook Kishon; beneath the range of Hermon lies Endor, and not afar off the village of Nain, each celebrated for the raising of the dead by divine power, for purposes characteristic of the different dispensations under which they occurred. On the east appear the mountains of Gilboa, and to the south-east the lake of Gennesareth — mingling the blue tint of its waves with the dark-brown hues of the barren hills by which it is encompassed. Farther on is seen a rising ground, from whence Christ delivered the sermon on the mount; and the whole view in that direction is bounded by the Mountain of snow which is often seen without a spot to break the surface of the dazzling white.² Encompassed with these spots, which will be dear to the heart of men to the end of time, stood that high mount to which the Savior, conscious of what was about to occur, led the three "apart" from the people, "by themselves," that is, separate from the other disciples.

"He went up to pray," that what he had been teaching them might bring forth its full fruits, that they might

¹ Other spots have been assigned by some modern commentators, but none of their reasons for abandoning the current tradition seem to be conclusive. Neither the distance from the place in which he had been (Caesarea Philippi), nor the probable existence of buildings, or of a small town on Tabor, more ancient than the Savior's time, are inconsistent with the prevailing opinion. To avoid the inconvenience, at least, of leaving the locality unfixed, we might, with this explanation, be allowed to consider Tabor as the place.— See Bush's Scripture Illustrations, and Kitto's Cyclopædia of Biblical Lit.

² Such is the description given by Maundrell ("A Journey from Aleppo to Jerusalem, at Easter, A. D. 1697,") and copied almost word for word by Buckingham, (see Bush's Script. Illust. Brattleboro, 1836. p. 134.). The passages cited from Josephus to prove the existence of a town on Tabor in our Savior's time, appear to us to demonstrate just the opposite. Cf. B. J. IV. 1, 8. II. 20, 6. V. S. 37. A. J. V. 1, 22; XIII. 15, 14. Josephus Opera. Paris, (Didot) 1847.

know Him, and the Father through him aright, that the doctrine of the cross might be realized by them in its divine beauty, that they might have grace to forsake every thing for him, and that they might have such a glimpse of the glory of God's kingdom as might be necessary to sustain them in all subsequent trial. "Father glorify thy Son, that thy Son may glorify thee;" and that prayer was answered, for :

"As he prayed, he was transfigured before them ; the fashion of his countenance was altered, and his face did shine as the sun ; and his raiment was white and glistening, became shining, exceeding white as snow ; so as no fuller on earth can white them, and . . . was white as the light."

After the prayer came the glory : the exaltation follows the prostration.

The transfiguration shows itself in two general results : 1) Upon the person, and 2) upon the garments of our Lord. Both presented a luminous appearance ; that of the garments being diffused through them from the person. The whole person, though concealed by the raiment, partook in the change ; the face is especially mentioned, as visible and a concentrating point of the lustre, and even the raiment, like a thin cloud behind which the setting sun is beaming, partakes in the light. He changed from a form, or condition, or outward appearance indicating one condition, into that of another. It does not imply that the essential outlines of his shape, or of his countenance were destroyed, or that he ceased to be truly man. It was a transfiguration, not a transubstantiation.

The term "form" never is used in the Bible to designate essence, but always outward appearance as connected with condition ; and to transfigure or transform never means a change in essence. We will not cite passages in which there is a general application of the word "form," but confine ourselves to those in which it is used with reference to the Lord Jesus. "His visage was so marred more than any man, and his FORM i. e. outward appearance, more than the sons of men," "he hath *no form* nor comeliness," "no beauty that we should desire him ;" i. e. the corrupt heart shall recoil from him as from physical deformity (Isa. 52: 14. and 53: 2.). "Who being in the form of God, — that is, the glorious condition of Deity — made himself of no reputation, divested himself, not of the essence of Godhead, but only of the display of its prerogatives ; and took upon him *the form*, or external condition of a servant" (Phil. 2: 6, 7.). The language of Paul seems to have in it some allusion to the Transfiguration. And after

Christ's appearing, subsequent to his resurrection, first to Mary Magdalene, it is said: (Mark 16: 12.), "And after that he appeared in another *form* unto two of them"—to interpret which of any change of substance, would imply, not that his resurrection body was different in essence from his previous one, but that itself was different in essence at different times.

In the same manner, we may show that the words "transfigure" and "transform" not only never mean change of essence, but are often expressly contradistinguished from it, (cf. Rom. 12: 2, where transformation, or outward exhibition of christian character is expressly separated from "renewing of the mind," and 2 Cor. 11: 13-15). It was not then, that Christ *obtained any new* prerogative, that he then did, what he could not have done at any time or all the time. He simply exercised a prerogative—showed himself in the "form of God." A king may disguise himself in the apparel of the meanest peasant, and thus move unknown in his dominions, but he does not cease to be a king because he has not his crown upon his brow, and his subjects pay him no homage; and if he chooses to put on the marks of his high office, he remains but what he was; and so was it with our Glorious King.

But though this change was one that pertained not to his essence, the Evangelists confess its transcendent character by the manner in which they labor to express it, and the variety of illustrations they employ. They use three adjectives in characterizing its splendor: 1.) "WHITE" or exceedingly radiant (cf. Dan. 7: 9.), like the garment of the ancient of days, and the angels who wear the livery of their king (Matth. 28: 3.), and as he now appears robed in glory (Rev. 1: 14.), and as his victorious people shall be in bliss (Rev. 3: 5.), for his blood renders the garments of his people white (Rev. 7: 14.), as his whole form through which it flowed rendered his own: "White" like that courser on which the bloodless victories of the Prince of Peace shall be won (Rev. 6: 2.), like the cloud in which, with his crown upon his head and his sickle in his hand, he shall come to reap the earth (Rev. 14: 14.), and, finally, "white" like that great throne from whose face the earth and heaven shall flee away" (Rev. 20: 11.).

2.) "SHINING" like the orbs of heaven (Dan. 12: 3.), like the face of Jehovah, from the Holy of Holies (Ps. 80: 1. Dan. 9: 17.), like the lustre of the home of God's elect (Rev. 28: 23.), the palace of the Son of God (Acts 26: 13.).

3.) "GLISTERING," flashing out the lightning (Dan. 10: 6.), rather, indeed, like the electric flush which lights the summer horizon, or the northern lights, than the glare of the thunder-bolt, or as the beam from the precious stone, or the burning drops in "the clear shining after rain."

But the most expressive terms are not regarded as sufficient by the Evangelists. Deserting their ordinary simple and unadorned phraseology, they seem to labor to express by accumulated language what no language can convey. There are four illustrations by which they strive to give some conception of the supranatural lustre:

1.) "The garments were white as no fuller could white them"; something surpassing all human art—every thing in human raiments either done by man's *art*, or seen by human eyes—miraculous and divine.

2.) "Exceeding white as snow." The purest of natural objects furnishes an illustration which human art could not give (Dan. 7: 9. Rev. 1: 14.). Snow is the world's image for spotless whiteness.

3.) "His face shone as the sun." The illustration rises from earth to the sky, and substitutes for the most lustrous of earthly objects the brightest known to us in the universe. That orb for which our planetary system is a tabernacle (Psal. 19: 4.), emblem of Jehovah (Ps. 84: 11.), whose light is the joy of the race (Eccles. 11: 7.), whose lustre shall be given to the righteous (Matth. 5: 43.), is fitly employed as an illustration of the surpassing glory which crowned the Son of God (Rev. 1: 16.). Though the shades of night were around them, and it was probably an hour when sleep was resting on human eyes (Luke 9: 32, 37.), their darkness yielded to something more than day. The wan, and wasted and sad face of the man of sorrows, whose whole life was a propitiation (Matth. 8: 17.), assumed its proper glory, and:

4.) "His garments became white as the LIGHT." It was the imparted glory of his person. Here illustration reaches its climax. It has passed from all manifestations of brightness to the very essence of it; and neither language nor thought, whether of man or God, can go beyond this, because there *is* nothing beyond. It is the garment of God (Ps. 104: 2.), the most perfect image of his essence (1 John 9: 5.), the nearest creature to his presence (Dan. 2: 22.), and ever streaming forth from it (Rev. 22: 5.), fit image of the symbolic apparel of the Son of God revealing himself as he is (Rev. 21: 23.).

In a word, the whole description runs parallel with the most majestic appearances of Jehovah under the old dispensation. (cf. Habak. 3: 3, 4, 5, 11.).

"And behold there appeared unto them, talked with him, two men which were Moses and Elias: who appeared in glory, who spake of his decease which he should accomplish at Jerusalem."

"And behold," in connection with this change another circumstance conspiring with the moral grandeur of the scene: "*There appeared unto them*" — not a phantom, but a reality (Math. 27: 53. Mark 16: 14.), not a dream but a waking reality, and talked with him two *men*, still men though in glory; not angels — their nature had not been assumed, and this present glory is not for them, not disembodied spirits, but men in the body. These were Moses and Elias; Moses the faithful leader, intercessor and lawgiver of Israel, the man of God, to whom God revealed himself more nearly than to any one under the Old dispensation (Exod. 3: 4-24, 2.), like unto whom no prophet afterward arose in Israel (Deut. 34: 10.), "beloved of God and men" (Eccles. 45: 1.); Moses, whom Joshua (Jesus, Hebr. 4: 8.) followed is here. Whether his body had been raised again, we cannot positively assert. It is most probable that it was. It is certainly not in conflict with such a supposition, that Christ is called the "first fruits of them that slept" — for the force of that phrase is, that the whole harvest of the dead was consecrated and accepted in him, as the first fruits waved before the altar sanctified the whole. After the painful necessity of preventing him from entering the promised land had been met by his death, God may have raised him again as a reward of his faithful toils. He shares here, at least, in the highest honor that can be given to man; and oh! how great the transition from meeting Jehovah in the flames and terror of Sinai, to the mild and benignant lustre which beams around his Son on Tabor. The law and grace; Moses the servant and Christ the Son; and speaking of the consummation of that which the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh. Moses coming forth from glory, to throw his arm around the cross; can the imagination conceive of a moral sublimity surpassing this?

And scarcely less illustrious is the other personage who appears. The Tishbite, who had been God's instrument in displaying the power of the resurrection, the fearless reprover of Kings, the dauntless adversary of Baal, and the destroyer of his priests, whose prayers opened the heavens and proved the precursors of his own undying body, which in the chariot of

the whirlwind, swift following the steeds whose wings were flame, was borne to the bosom of God.

"They appear in Glory," not sorrowing as in the days of their toil and conflict, but with the brightness of their heavenly home about them (Jno. 17: 5, 22; Rom. 8: 18; 1 Cor. 15: 43; Col. 3: 4.).

They hold communion with their Redeemer and Master, and speak of the conclusion of that journey, which in sorrow and pain his feet were performing. They speak of his "decease" or Exodus, (antithetical to his *ἔλθοις* or coming in, Acts 13: 24.), his transition from this world, like Israel departing from Egypt (Heb. 11: 22.), for life is a pilgrimage (2 Pet. 1: 15; Heb. 13: 12, seq.). The word here employed is very emphatic, embracing, either directly or by implication, his passion, cross, death, resurrection and ascension.¹ "Which he was about to accomplish," fulfill, complete or perform. This remarkable word implies, that his death was not *endured*, but voluntarily met, that it was comprehended in his purposes, and in view of its objects, in his desires, that it was essential to the completion of his plans, and that without it prophecy would be unfulfilled. "At Jerusalem," the place appointed for sacrifice, the spot where the shadows of the old dispensation centred, and which had been the scene of his labors, his prayers and his tears. The cup of her guilt, already full, is soon to overflow, by the act to whose atrocity all human crime finds no parallel (Luke 13: 33; Mat. 23: 37.).

But whilst they speak of his sufferings, they are not mute in regard to the glory which is to follow. Their very presence suggests the home which awaits him beyond the tomb, and their reverence is an anticipation of the homage of heaven, which he had left for the welfare of the world, and to which he was soon to return.

"But Peter and they that were with him were heavy with sleep: and when they were awake, they saw his glory, and the two men that stood with him."

This fact would demonstrate that no portion of the Transfiguration is to be regarded as a vision² or subjective impression, even if the whole narrative did not perfectly annihilate such a supposition.

¹ Bengelii Gnomon.

² Calvin, though he adheres to the objective character of the appearance of Moses and Elias, yet expresses himself in a way that is to our minds very painful. "*Quaeritur tamen verene adfuerint, an spectrum duntaxat oblatum fuerit discipulis. . . . Quoniam res est in utranque partem disputabilis, (ut*

Their slumber was either the result of bodily or mental fatigue, or of the collapse after high, strong excitement (cf. Mat. 16) or internal expectation, arising from the manner in which the Savior had withdrawn them (Mat. 26: 44.). Nor would it be an untenable ground, to suppose, that they were under that supernatural tendency to slumber, which so often preceded or accompanied divine revelations or events. As natural sleep is designed to brace up the powers to their natural extent, so may the supernatural slumber be designed to invigorate the faculties to an extraordinary degree. In the prophetic trance, there was a development of the highest kind of perception of the inward eye,¹ and the miraculous slumber may have been followed by the same sort of intense consciousness, both physical and intellectual (cf. Gen. 2: 21; 15: 12; Job. 4: 12-16; Dan. 8: 18; 10: 9.).

"And when they awaked," under the same divine influence which caused them to slumber. There may have been something connected with the converse of Moses and Elias with our Lord, which was not given to men in the flesh to hear.—Though the good man, in this life, may be quite in the verge of heaven, there is still something beyond (cf. 2 Cor. 12: 1-4.). This fact shows that the Transfiguration was not merely designed to instruct and comfort the disciples, but that a part of it at least was designed more for him than for them.

"They saw this glory"—which Moses had begged to see (Exod. 33: 13; cf. Ezek. 9: 3.), which the dying Stephen beheld (Acts 7: 55), and which all saints shall behold (Rev. 21: 11, 23.). This glory (Jno. 1: 14.), which has already been described, opened upon their astonished eyes—"and they saw the two men that stood with him."

"And it came to pass, as they departed from him, then answered Peter and said unto Jesus, (Lord, Rabbi,) Master, it is good for us to be here: and if thou wilt, let us make here three tabernacles; one for thee, and one for Moses, and one for Elias: not knowing what he said: for he wist not what to say: for they were sore afraid."

As they were in the act of departing, Peter, wrapt into the glory of the scene, with fear and wonder, and faith, and joy

liquetur) probabilis tamen est, ipsos vere, &c" On this point too, the great and valuable work of Neander (*Das Leben Jesu Christi*) takes a ground which it is impossible for him to harmonize with the principles on which he so triumphantly every where overthrows the rationalistic and mythical theories. It would be just as easy to interpret the resurrection subjectively, as the transfiguration.

¹ See Hengstenberg's *Christology*.

struggling in his bosom, and in their conflict with his self-reliance, and the remnants of nature and the world, in his heart, making chaos, with a rapture high but undefined, not forgetting the reproof of his officiousness (Mat. 16 : 22, 23), for he says humbly, "if thou wilt," yet with something of the same disposition to interfere in the arrangements presented by God, exclaims, "it is good to be here." Here we are withdrawn from the cold world which hates thee and us, where thy glory has been dimly revealed, compared with its manifestation here; there we had no such near view of thee. Thou hast spoken of dying for us, but we would rather have thee live for us.—Nothing can render thee more glorious than thou art now in our eyes. Surely we are here entered into the true Canaan; the toils and perils of the desert are past. Let us keep a holy festival of tabernacles; it is not needful to go to Jerusalem to keep it, for the presence of the Lord is here, and *here* let us build. Thou hast brought us into such fellowship with thee, and hast introduced us into the companionship of those heavenly ones, so that we may dare to ask thee to permit us to abide beneath the same roof;¹ (cf. Lev. 23 : 33, 34, and Zech. 14 : 16.), or if this may not be, it will be glory enough to wait without and serve our king and his heavenly guests. But Peter saw not the utter folly of what he uttered; the selfishness and pride, and repugnance to the cross which he manifested; but the terror inspired by the sight of the glory, which no man can see in its fullness and live, and that general awe, which the appearance of the departed would inspire, plead the extenuation of his fault.

"While he yet thus spake, behold there was—came, a bright cloud, that overshadowed them : and they feared as they entered into the cloud : and behold a voice came out of the cloud, which said, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased : hear ye him."

Peter had displayed the natural propensity of the human heart; the seeking for a sign, the desire to see the kingdom of God coming "with observation," it is not enough for him to know that the Word is tabernacling among us in flesh, but he wishes always to see the glory in the tabernacle. He has not yet learned to appreciate the moral glory of Christianity; the excitement of the wonderful, the presence of the dead and the translated; this he thinks sure gain over and above the calmer communion with Christ in his lowliness. He wishes to make the special ordinary, thus substituting a craving for novelty for

¹ Peter may have thought of himself as destined in this arrangement to occupy the same tabernacle with his Lord.

the deep grace of a kingdom of God within man. He thus furnishes a true type of zeal undisciplined and unnatural; a zeal which continues to show itself to the present hour, in many, who like him, have just come to the experience that "Jesus is the Christ," and will have him straightway in a tabernacle of their own making, redeeming by a short and easy method, in *their* way. That such an abuse as this of this glorious scene, might find no countenance, that we might know that we are to seek to the living and not to the dead, that we are to look to Christ, and not to the law and the Prophets, that *He* is all sufficient, that Moses and Elias have no right to tabernacles in our world at all, far less by the side of the Son of God, and that till we meet him in glory, the "hope of Israel, the Savior thereof, will continue in some sense to be as a stranger in the land, and as a wayfaring man that turneth aside to tarry for a night" (Jer. 14 : 8), all these rendered necessary the appearance of the cloud, which betokened the presence of Jehovah; and the intimation which came from it. Moses and Elias¹ "entered into the cloud," to teach that, having once departed from this world, the righteous have no further work to do. Having died in the Lord, they are blessed from *henceforth*, and rest from their labors. Our Lord and his disciples remained, for, until the course is finished and the work is done, we are to have no abiding city; no, not a tabernacle which we may call our own. But above all, the voice directed the disciples, and all our race, to the *only mediator, teacher and guide* whom God has given, or will give to our guilty race (cf. Mat. 3 : 17; Deut. 15 : 18, 19.).

The effect of this wonderful completion of the circle of divine manifestation, is thus described: "*And when the disciples heard it, they fell on their faces* (Exod. 19 : 16; Lev. 9 : 24; Ezek. 1 : 28; Dan. 8 : 17; Rev. 11 : 16;) *and were sore afraid* (Judges 6 : 22, 23; 13 : 22; Is. 6 : 5). *And Jesus came and touched them;* to show that he was still in the flesh (cf. Luke 24 : 39.) *and said, Arise and be not afraid* (Dan. 10 : 18, 19). *And when they had lifted up their eyes, they saw no man save Jesus alone.*"

It is worthy of remark that, in its connection, the Transfiguration assists in completing a perfect chain of demonstration in regard to the proper Deity of Christ. We see him *as God* under three distinct attitudes in this miracle, and in the one that

¹ So the Syriac version, and correctly. It was thus they withdrew. The disciples were prostrate. The language implies that the cloud was above them. The examples, in which the same relative pronoun alludes in the same sentence to different persons, are familiar to all Biblical students.

precedes, and that which follows it. We have first, the miraculous multiplication of food (Mat. 15 : 34-38) : secondly, the Transfiguration, (Mat. 17 : 1-8) : and thirdly, the healing of the demoniac (17 : 15-18). In the first, he appears as *Creator*. "This miracle," says Neander,¹ "formed the very acme of Christ's miraculous power ; in it, creative agency was most strikingly prominent." The second, presents him as God revealed in accordance with the nature of unfallen or holy beings ; the third, in the character of *Redeemer*, or as God manifested in accordance with the wants of sinful and ruined creatures. These form the whole of the general methods in which the Son of God could be revealed, and in the very order of time, and of history, which we find marking the divine dispensation.

From this narrative and its connections, we may reproduce then, Creation, Paradise, the Fall (Mat. 19 ; 6), the Mosaic dispensation ; God from the cloud, the Prophets, the Messiah in suffering and glory, the kingdom of Heaven, the Judgment, the Resurrection, the bliss of the eternal world, and this naturally brings before us fully the question :

To what end was the Transfiguration ? What were its uses to the disciples, and what are they to us and believers of all time ?

The great facts of the history of the Son of God, swell into greater significance, as the stream of human events rolls on.— They enlarge with the circle of humanity, and each age may understand them better than the past. There are great principles now considered as unquestioned, lying, to our eyes, upon the very surface which past ages not only did not, but could not understand. All Biblical history is prophecy also, with the shadow of the future clinging to the substance of the past ; presenting the mirror of the church, or of the race in the individual, and revealing not only events, but their order and their causes.²

¹ Life of Jesus Christ, &c., translated from the fourth German Edition, by John McClintock and Charles E. Blumenthal. New York, 1848.

² This fact was clearly seen by the ancient interpreters, and is often beautifully, and perhaps quite as often incorrectly applied. For instance, in regard to the very narrative before us, Hilary (A. D. 370) from the words, "after six days," deduces a proof that the general resurrection and renovation of the world will take place six thousand years after the creation, a sentiment in which many of the greatest of the fathers concurred, though they did not attempt to establish it by this passage (as for example, Jerome, Irenæus, Lactantius and Augustine). The relation which will be shown (p. 254.) between the Transfiguration and general Judgment, will cause Hilary's view to appear less forced than it does at the first glance. The Sabbath of a World's

I. The first fact in regard to the Transfiguration of our Lord, which suggests itself, is that it shows the nature and glory of his person as "only begotten Son of God, begotten of the Father from eternity, God of God, light of light, very God of very God, begotten, not made, of one substance with the Father, who for our salvation descended from the heavens, and became incarnate by the Holy Ghost."¹ "God and man, equal with the Father according to his divinity, less than the Father according to his humanity,"² "so that there are two natures, divine and human, inseparably conjoined in unity of person."³ The change of form, the glory, the luminous cloud and the voice that came from it, attested these great doctrines. They demonstrated his identity with that Jehovah who had revealed himself under the old dispensation. God, in manifesting himself to man, must in some way address himself to the senses, which are certainly the only *ordinary* avenues to the soul of man. Hence we see him sometimes in human form, sometimes in flame, as at the bush and on Sinai, sometimes in glorious effulgence, as between the cherubim in the Tabernacle and Temple. Of all these forms, the most frequent was that of the Shekinah or supernatural LIGHT, most fitting as the garment of Him who "is light," and who would tell his creatures by the very drapery He casts around him, that "in Him is no darkness at all."⁴ Nor is it possible for us to say, that the highest vision, which either angels or the disembodied spirits of men can have of God, is not *necessarily* connected with such a radiance. We cannot draw, everywhere, the line between what we *now call* matter and spirit, or say, at that wondrous point at which the one melts away and the other appears, that there are not stupendous phenomena, in which the attributes of the two classes of being can be separated by no finite mind, in which the divine contradiction of "SPIRITUAL BODY" shall not be harmonized; for the ultimate principles and powers of matter are as far beyond our reach as those of spirit. As Jehovah utters the final truth which the

Transfiguration shall indeed follow its week of toil. "Der Himmel hat itzo an sein Werkeltages-Kleid, dort aber wird er anziehen sein Sonntags-Kleid." (Luther).

¹ Nicene Creed. ² Athanasian Creed. ³ Augsburg Conf. Art. IV.

⁴ "When in the little circle of the sun, which from its distance appears no larger than the head of a man, there is yet such an intense splendor that the eyes of men are unable to fix themselves upon it, and after a moment's glance grow weak, and are suffused with mist and darkness; quid tandem luminis, quid claritatis apud ipsum Deum, penes quem nulla nox est, esse arbitremur?" Lactantius (VI. 2.) Divin. Institut.

Opera Omnia e Cellarius, Lipsiae, 1698.

human mind can embrace in regard to Himself, when He says, "*I am that I am*," so can we say, that we only know one absolute truth in regard to *matter*, that it *exists*. We will not pretend to separate the theology from the poetry, therefore, in that sublime address of Milton :

"Hail holy Light, offspring of Heaven first-born,
Or of the Eternal coeternal beam
May I express thee unblamed? since God is light,
And never but in unapproached light
Dwelt from eternity, dwelt then in thee,
Bright effluence of bright essence increate."

In all the revelations of the Deity, the Father was manifested only in the Son. "No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him." This glorious apparel of light is what Paul calls "*the form of God*," and which he tells us Christ laid aside for "*the form of a servant*," and "*the fashion of a man*." Had he moved among men, retaining this token of his glory, there could have been no proper humiliation, no possibility of his being seized "according to the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God," that he might be offered as the victim for the sins of the world; the whole character of the dispensation would have been altered, the walking by sight would have been substituted for that of walking by faith, the great wants of humanity would have been wholly unmet, and, as far as its highest objects now known to us, are concerned, the coming of the Son of God would have been vain. There could have been no real discipleship; and that near and tender approach in the spirit of Love which casteth out fear, which we have in coming to God revealed in our flesh, would have been wholly impossible. His first appearance would have inspired terror, like that which actually prostrated his disciples at this time with awe. But reverence would soon have yielded to a vulgar curiosity, and staring would have been first insane to see the wondrous spectacle, and then forever satiated and indifferent.

Hitherto his disciples may be said, in a certain sense, to have seen him only in his lowliness. Whatever he had told them of his deity, was indeed confirmed by miracles, but those intimations were yet comparatively few, and those signs and wonders of the same general class that had been exhibited by former messengers of God. In each of his miracles a single ray of his glory, as it were, shot forth, as a glimpse of sunshine through a cleft in the drifting clouds, but here for a little space,

the whole blackness was rolled back, and his proper and "glorious shape" seems another morn

"Risen on mid-noon."¹

The disciples now saw that the tabernacle of God was indeed with men, they came unto the Holy of Holies in the exercise of that high-priesthood to which all believers are now introduced through Christ, for that veil which was to be rent forever on Calvary, was drawn aside by a gracious anticipation, and Moses and Elias symbolizing, yea, rather actually exhibiting the same truth which the Cherubim showed in type (that the hosts of heaven "desire to look into these things"), there with that true "*Shepherd of Israel*" who led Joseph like a flock, shining forth in his Father's glory and his own, showed that the New Jerusalem had descended from heaven, and that he who is of the seed of David, according to the flesh, is God over all, blessed forever."²

II. As Christ thus marked his Godhead, he attested his power to redeem, which human consciousness, untortured by false philosophy, can never separate from his possession of the "fulness of the Godhead bodily."³ The heart of man cannot rest in a created Savior. Just as instinctively as it draws back from God in his absoluteness on the one side, and asks for him in our flesh, does it demand on the other, that the humanity shall not be absolute; that the Word shall be in the flesh, and that it shall not be mocked by the palpable delusion of mere man working out redemption for man. The thirsting race has gone, too, often to cisterns, which, if not broken so as to

¹ "Locum etiam habere coepit temporalis ille conspectus ejus gloriæ, ut certo constaret etiam quo tempore exinanitus fuit, deitatem tamen suam illi integram stetisse, licet abscondita esset carnis velo."

Calvinus in Novi Testamenti Cathol. Expositio. autore A. Marlorato edit. quinta. Geneva 1593, Folio.

² Of course all this was designed to establish, in the strongest manner, his Messiahship; and so the disciples understood it, as their question, and the way it is proposed (Matt. xvii. 10) imply. So also Peter (ii. Pet. 1: 16).—The centre in which all the other purposes meet, is to be found in the words "Hear Him."

³ Macarius has a very beautiful idea which might easily be associated with the Transfiguration of Christ. It is, that the light on the face of Moses was the appearance of a lustre which had beamed upon the countenance of man in the innocence of Eden, a sort of seal from the hand of God. Man, says Paul, is "the image" and glory of God—the true earthly Schekinah. If we consent to the view of Macarius, the glory of Christ on Tabor would be symbolical also of the character of his humanity; and of the nature of his work as the restorer of the original glory of man, as the re-opener of Paradise. It would become a direct token in advance that the second Adam would abolish death and every consequence of the fall: See Macarii Opera. Lipsiæ, 1714. Vol. I. p. 73.

hold no water, were, at least, soon drained by insatiate lips. Stumbling, it must have "the way," dying, it must have "the life." Redemption weaves up the garland of our immortal hopes with the silver thread of Deity; *that* withdrawn, the flowers lie scattered on the ground, and man, relapsing into the brutishness of despair, tramples them beneath his feet. No acts or sufferings but those of the incarnate God will suffice for our redemption. Could God have devised some other scheme to meet his desires, it could not have met our wants, unless man had ceased to be man. The heart of our race is fired then by the scene on the "holy mount," where the Son of God "decked himself in his glorious apparel and appeared in the greatness of his strength," that he might prove that "he spake in righteousness, that he was mighty to save," and that he was fited "to tread the wine-press of the Almighty's wrath alone."

III. It testified also the *voluntary character* of the sufferings he was soon to undergo. Of these he had recently been speaking with increasing clearness (Matth. 16: 21.). Though Peter had entered more deeply than any of the other disciples into an appreciation of the character of Christ (16: 17.), yet he was not prepared for the doctrine of the cross (22.), and showed plainly that the trial of the faith of the Apostles, in Christ crucified, would be a terrible one. He wishes to strengthen the leading Apostles that they may support the others. He desires that, even in the thick darkness of the mystery of his death, they may know that nothing can prevent his glory and triumph in the redemption of men. They must learn, if possible, that nothing has arisen unforeseen to destroy his plans. Can they suppose that the August Being, whom they have seen transfigured, attended by the highest of the glorified servants of God, with the "excellent glory" of Jehovah blazing around him, and attested by the voice from heaven to be God's beloved Son in whom He is pleased; can they believe that he cannot retain his life, that he *must* endure that worse than mortal anguish, unable to deliver himself, and dying though reluctant to die? It is for these reasons that Moses and Elias speak of his approaching death, and that our Savior renews the theme as they descend the mount, and afterwards selects them, because they have been best prepared for it, to be present at his agony in Gethsemane.

IV. We may suggest farther, that the Transfiguration bore a part in the development of the character of Christ towards "*perfection*," a term in whose employment (sanctioned by

Scripture,) we of course contemplate him as the man and Mediator only. As he possessed a human body which grew in "stature," so he necessarily possessed a human soul which grew "in wisdom." God took upon him human nature, not merely a human form or body, which might be the machine of indwelling Deity. The child grew and waxed strong in spirit, "deriving, as one of our race, his knowledge from the same fountain and in the same way as ourselves" (Isa. 11 : 2, 3.). "It became him for whom are all things and by whom are all things, in bringing many sons unto glory, to make the Captain of their salvation perfect through sufferings," for "though he were a Son, yet he learned obedience by the things which he suffered ; and having been made perfect, he became the author of eternal salvation unto all that obey him" (Heb. 2 : 10. 5 : 8, 9.).

The Transfiguration may be said to have brought his two natures into a more perfect intercommunion, and was an outward testimony, that he was not misled by that deep consciousness which as man he felt of the indwelling Godhead. It elevated his humanity, which had consented to forego the privileges which naturally became its own by personal union with the Deity, and to receive, by degrees, by training, what it might have had by intuition, as divine-human. It made him capable of the still more exalted portions of his duty, and the still sterner sufferings which awaited him. This view is corroborated when we remember that, during the agony at the mount Olives, "there appeared an angel unto him from heaven, strengthening him" (Luke 25 : 43.). It was of these scenes, too, as though they were connected in some way with this glorious proof that he was the Son of God, that Moses and Elias spake. The light, the converse, the voice could not be torn from his remembrance, or their forming power from his character, in the darkest hour.²

V. The transfiguration may be regarded as a foreshadowing of the coming of Jesus in clouds of glory with his holy angels to judge the quick and the dead. The realm of the dead and

¹ Though τελειόω in these passages embraces in it beyond question the idea of advance to perfect happiness and glory, yet it conveys it as the termination of a development not only of a higher from a lower condition, but also of a greater from a less official fitness, as v. 8. clearly shows.

² O Tabor! not thy snow-born streams;
O Tabor! not thine orient beams
So purely flow, so brightly shine,
As shone that awful light divine;
Which round the praying Savior flowed,
To raise the man, and mark the God.

the hosts of heaven were represented by Moses and Elias, the mountain was a figure of that throne "high and lifted up," on which the Lord of glory shall appear, when all other thrones shall be cast down; when a fiery stream shall issue and come forth before him; when the judgment shall be set and the books be opened. The disciples are the representatives of mankind; and the solemn words of the Father:—"Hear Him," intimate by what law the decision shall be made which will separate man from man in that day. The terror which inspires the Apostles shows that the hearts of all flesh would sink in that awful hour if left to themselves;¹ and the reviving touch and cheering command of Jesus, show whence the confidence and joy of that day shall flow to the believer. When they lift up their eyes they see Jesus *alone*, even as the eyes of all saints shall be fixed upon him. Though cherubim and seraphim blaze around the throne, they will be able to see but *one*: "Whom have I in heaven but thee"—"thou art chiefest among ten thousand and altogether lovely."

Their conversation, as they descend the mount, teaches us that the bliss, which shall follow the resurrection, will in part consist in sweet reminiscences of suffering leading to glory. We shall speak of our Savior's toils—perhaps to him, and he may tell, so as to shed glory upon us, before angels and the redeemed, the little, which, by his grace, we were enabled to do and suffer for him.

But there are some who shall be stricken to the earth by his glory, whom no hand shall raise. "They shall look upon him whom they have pierced," and "shall wail because of him;" as from the wounds of the slain Lamb which shall seem to them still unclosed, the intensest light of his glory shall appear to stream.²

¹ "In hoc exemplo proponitur, ... quod hæc humana natura non potest sustinere Dei conspectum. ... Quia natura polluta peccato, metuit et fugit judicem. ... Ideo intercessit pro nobis Filius Dei ... Postea nobis parit, quando hunc Filium fide apprehendimus, quando ipse nos contrahat, et dicit: Noli timere." Melancthon Conciones in Matthæum, in the third volume of his Works. Wittenbergæ, 1563.

² "Tunc, trepidi adspiciunt clavo transfixa trabali
Brachia, et invidiæ tot documenta suæ,
Transfixum latus, quod militis hianserat hasta,
Ultoremque tremet gens scelerata Deum."

From a feeling of the moral connection between the Transfiguration, the Resurrection and the general Judgment, arose a legendary location of the last two events at the scene of the first. "On that hill (Tabor) and in that same place," says Sir John Maundeville (A. D. 1322,), "at Doomsday, four angels shall blow with four trumpets, and raise all men, that have suffered death since the world was created, to life; and they shall come in body and

VI. At this point the narrative reveals itself in intimate association with the whole Biblical doctrine in regard to man's immortality.

For, in the first place, it confirms the truth of Christ's resurrection, on which depends all assurance of our own (1 Cor. 15.). We see something of the nature of that glorified body which is to arise from the darkness of the tomb. No objection to his ability to triumph over death and hell can be drawn from his infirmity; because we have seen every trace of human imperfection disappear in a moment, "the mortal putting on immortality."¹

The appearance, moreover, of Moses and Elias shows, that man has a separate waking and conscious existence after death; is neither absorbed back into the Godhead, nor resting torpidly until the last day. It shows that there is a spiritual world, adapted to the glorified bodies of all saints, as it was to that of Elijah and perhaps of Moses; and never have there met in our world three confessors, whose lives taught more sublimely, than did those of these heavenly visitants and our Lord, that, through toil and suffering, the glory of that world is to be reached, and that "they that sow in tears shall reap in joy."

It is principally this use which Luther makes of the Transfiguration, and his remarks in regard to it are so rich and full, that we are sure we need make no apology for their introduction with little abridgment.

"In this history are embraced many things.

1. In the first place is shown the resurrection of the dead and the future glory even of our bodies. For this was wonderful, that Christ was glorified in his body still mortal and subject to suffering, and thus showed the glory of immortality, though still in mortality. What, then, shall it be, when mor-

soul in judgment ... And it shall be on Easter-day, the time of our Lord's Resurrection."

"The Book of Sir John Maundeville," contained in "Early Travels in Palestine," &c. Edited with notes by Thomas Wright: London, 1848.

¹ "As the body was glorified when he ascended the mountain, and was transfigured into the divine glory, and into the boundless light: so also the bodies of the saints shall be glorified, and shall shine like the light. For as the inward glory of Christ so interwove itself with the body and shone forth: in the same way also in the saints the inward power of Christ shall, in that day, be poured forth outwardly upon their bodies.... As from one and the same fire many lamps are kindled, so also is it necessary that the bodies of the saints which are members of Christ, should become the same as Christ himself." Macarii Ægyptii Opuscula. Ed. Jo. Georg. Pritius. Lipsiæ, 1714. 2 vols. Vol. II. 223.

tality, having been swallowed up, all shall be glory and immortality?

2. In the second place, to this occurrence, so wonderful in itself, is added the appearance of Moses and Elias, who, although they were regarded as dead, showed by that very appearance, that they were not dead, but merely transferred to another sort of existence. They made it clear, too, that the life, into which they had passed from this mortal one, was very different from it. For, in a life resembling this, their existence could not have been prolonged so many hundred years as had passed between their departure from this world and their appearing. Yet here, they not only live, but show that they had really been dead.

3. In the third place, we have these two most faithful witnesses, Moses and Elias, that the dead are not dead, and that the dying pass from this sorrowful and troublous life to a better. Their appearance proved that death is not annihilation. We are taught, therefore, that death is to be despised, for it is a change from the prison-house to glory. We may think of it as a journey, or with the Scriptures call it a sleep. Blessed be God that the darkness, which covered the Gentiles, has been dispelled from us by the promise of eternal life, and by its demonstration through this appearing.

4. In the last place, we see here that sin is overcome. For where death is conquered, sin is conquered; for death is nothing but the wages of sin (Rom. 6.). Sin and death, therefore, being taken away by Christ, we are freed from the power of Satan, and we await, when mortality shall have been swallowed up of life, the brightness of eternal glory, which, in the Transfiguration, Christ showed in his body still passible and mortal.¹

We may add, then, in conclusion, that the Transfiguration, with its attendant circumstances, furnishes a striking testimony to the truth of the closing articles of the Apostles' Creed: "the communion of saints,² the forgiveness of sins, the resurrection of the flesh, and the life everlasting."

¹ Annotationes D. Mart. Luth. in Aliquot Cap. Matthaei, ab autore, non ut ederentur, sed in Amici cujusdam privatum usum, scriptae. A. D. 1538. In the fourth volume of his Latin works. Jena, 1583.

² "Here we learn, in what way the saints are employed in heaven. It is certain, that those who are in heaven are solicitous for the church and pray for it, as Moses and Elias here speak with the Son of God in regard to his passion and resurrection, and the gathering together of the church."

MELANCHTHON.

Closely associated with this is the doctrine of the recognition of believers in the eternal world, which some of the old writers deduce from this narrative.

VII. The closing remark, which we shall offer on this part of our subject, is that the Transfiguration presents, in a strong light, the *moral* beauty of the Christian religion. It is a system, whose facts correspond with its declarations and promises (Matth. 16: 28, compared with 17: 1.), in which comparative faithfulness in the use of present grace leads to higher privileges, so that "to him that hath is given more abundantly," in which fearlessness of confession (Peter), tenderness of love (John), and willingness to suffer for Christ (James), are rewarded by most intimate communion with him, and the most certain approach to the contemplation and enjoyment of his glory. It alone conducts us to that height above the world, where, separated from earthly associations and the cares of life, Christ manifests himself unto us as he does not unto the world" (Matth. 17: 1.). The Christian religion invests Christ with his true form, and hallows all that touches him, because that very contact imparts to the meanest object a grace and glory beyond the highest reach of earthly power (Mark 9: 3.). It makes all holy beings, whether on earth or in heaven, members of one family, bound by the closest ties to one another, by their interest in Jesus the common head (Matth. 17: 3.). It condescends to the infirmity of men, and moves them from the stupor of the natural condition to a contemplation of the "glory of God in the face of Christ Jesus" (Luke 9: 32.). In it the Son glorifies the Father, and the Father the Son (Matth. 17: 6.). It gives the spirit of childlike confidence, which casts out fear (v. 7.). It prepares for every trial and shows how affliction can be made to "work out a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory" (v. 9.).

We turn now to a distinct consideration of the second great fact in this narrative: the association of Moses and Elias with the Transfiguration of our Redeemer. A tradition existed among the Jews in our Savior's time, that these illustrious personages would appear in connection with the Messiah. Whether this opinion resulted from some unrecorded prophecy, or was the result of the general consciousness of a moral fitness in their appearing, we cannot stop to inquire.¹ No wide-

It certainly shows that they *may* know one another, though that is not exactly establishing the point in question, which is whether they will. See Osiandri *Biblia Sacra* (in Luc. 9: 33.). Francofurti, 1611, and Doederlein *Institutio Theologi Christiani*, &c. Ed. quinta. Norembergae et Altorfi, 1791. Lib. II. P. II. Cap. II. sec. II. Obs. 5. Doederlein beautifully sums up the main reasons for believing that there will be a recognition on the part of Christian friends.

¹ Cf. Malachi 4: 4, 5, where it is said that Elijah will come before the Messiah, and where they are called on to remember the law of Moses. The

spread popular sentiment is entirely arbitrary, and the fact that they were expected, that the minds of the Apostles doubtless shared in the popular sentiment, would have rendered these the proper persons for this great honor, had there been in other respects a perfect balance between them, and other honored inhabitants of the heavenly world. But apart from this consideration we would say, that,

I. In the first place, their *personal* character marked them as most worthy, among all the Old Testament heroes and saints, of a participation in this glory. "Why," asks Chrysostom,¹ "were they brought upon the scene? Many reasons might be assigned: and in the first place, since the people thought, in regard to Christ, some that he was Elias, and others Jeremias, or one of the old prophets, (Matt. 16: 14.), these two, who were the greatest of them, were introduced, that the wide distinction between the Master and the servants might be marked, and that it might be seen that Peter had deserved approval, when he confessed him to be the Son of God (Matt. 16: 16, 17). . . . To all other considerations we are to add, that eminent and illustrious virtue of these men, which furnished an example of what he so earnestly demanded of his disciples. For he had said (Matt. 16: 24.): 'If any man will come after me, let him deny himself and take up his cross and follow me;' for this reason he places those before them who, a hundred times, in guarding the precepts of God, and in watching over the people entrusted to them, had encountered the peril of death: each of them in losing his life had found it (Matt. 16: 25.): each of them had spoken against tyrants with great freedom, the one against the Egyptian king, the other against Ahab. And it was a great thing, that though private men, and without power, they endeavored to rescue the people from idolatry, though encountered by an ungrateful and disobedient spirit, which frequently subjected them to the greatest dangers: and all this, though the one was 'slow of speech, and of a slow tongue:' and the other yet more plain and home-bred, and both complete despisers of that earthly wealth by which men often secure their ends. Moses had no possessions, 'esteeming the reproach of Christ greater riches

remarkable facts connected with the bodies of both Moses and Elias, might excite also the expectation, that something remarkable was yet to be accomplished by them, and nothing was more natural to the Jewish mind than to associate them with the Messiah. It is not necessary here to recite the traditions themselves. They can be found in any good Commentary.

¹ In Matt. Homil LVII.

than the treasures in Egypt,' nor had Elias aught but his leathern girdle; and thus was it, even in their old age, for they drew no personal advantage from the favor with which they were regarded by many. For their devotion to the welfare of the people, their strength of mind and constancy, they are introduced as examples: that the meekness of Moses, and the zeal of Elias might be the objects of their imitation: yet were they to surpass them in the spirit of a better dispensation."—When James and John desired to call fire from heaven to consume Christ's enemies, and appealed to the example of Elias, as though this were an inference they had drawn from his appearance on the Mount, 'the Son of God rebuked them, and said, "ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of. For the Son of man is not come to destroy men's lives, but to save them" (Luke 9: 54, 56.).

II. A still higher reason for their introduction was, that in their official character, as the representatives of the law and prophets, they might bear witness against Christ's enemies in regard to the purity of his character, the glory of his dispensation, and his position, not only as its revealer, but its sum and centre.

"The Jews had constantly accused him as a transgressor of the law, and had thought him a blasphemer, in claiming as his own, the glory of his Father; they had said: 'This man is not of God, because he keepeth not the Sabbath.' And again, 'for a good work we stone thee not, but because thou being a man, makest thyself God.' Nothing could better show the invidious character of these charges, of the violation of the law, and of the attempt to claim God's glory, which was none of his, than the appearance of two such strenuous supporters of both. For Moses had given the law; and no Jew could believe, that he would permit the law to be trodden upon, and pay homage to one who was its transgressor and his enemy.—Elias had been zealous for the glory of God, and, when almost every knee had bowed to Baal, remained steadfast; he was the last of men to stand with one who would falsely pretend to be equal with the Father; the last who would obey an usurper. Their appearing, moreover, showed that Christ was indeed Lord of the world of spirits, and of heaven," yea of the quick and the dead, "for he placed in their midst Moses, who had died, and Elias, who without dying, had passed into heaven."¹

¹Chrysostom Hom. in Matthæum LVII. It is into these two classes Paul divides the subjects of the Resurrection; those who are changed after death, and those who "shall not sleep," but "shall be changed." (1 Cor. 15: 51.)

They appeared further, that the strong antithesis of the two dispensations might be marked, and that the superior glory of Christ's and the transition of the first might be shown.

The hand of inspiration has already drawn at length, the difference of the features of the two economies (cf. Exod. 34, and 2 Cor. 3: 7.), and has shown the surpassing and abiding glory of the second.

Moses and Elias appear "in glory" (Luke 9: 31.), and thus show that the grandeur of their mission arises from its relation to Christ; that they are greatest in serving him, and that their system passed away, not by being destroyed, but by being fulfilled, "for Christ is the end of the law."¹ Their authority was abrogated by two words, forever: Hear HIM, and him alone.² Before these words were uttered, they were withdrawn, and as the dove descended on Christ at his baptism, that none might apply to John, the words that came forth from the parted heavens for him, so here Christ stands alone, that the hand of God may be, as it were, laid upon his head. "This is my beloved Son."

They had spoken, not of the glories of heaven, but of something, in its due time and place, more glorious, even the cross of Christ, and when Christ *touches* the disciples, it continues the lesson of the cross, that is, that the humanity of Christ is the organ of Deity; that nothing divine may in the mediatorial kingdom be separated from the human. It is the *voice*, the *touch*, the reception into his arms, some act of his humanity from which, not a single exertion of divine power recorded of Christ in the Gospels, is sundered. The faith, that touches his garment, will be assured that "virtue has gone out of *him*," to heal every plague; or receiving the bread from his hand, will know that it is the bread of life, because "it is the communion of *his* body." It is this that makes the new dispensation. Moses was not essential to the first, but there can be no christianity without Christ; he is "*the way, the truth, the life*," "no man can come to the Father but through him, and without him we can do nothing." All earthly glory, even the

¹ "Ut ergo rite Moses opera utamur, in ipso haerendum non est, sed danda opera ut per ipsum manu ducamur ad Christum, ejus minister est una cum aliis omnibus." Musculus in Marlorati Cathol. Exposit.

² Melancthon beautifully employs the Transfiguration of Christ to show, that no weight of human councils can avail against the clear teachings of God's Son.

"Cogites igitur hoc colloquium Dei, Filii, Moisis, Eliae esse *Synodum praecipuam*, in qua de summa doctrinae Evangelii tales personae colloquuntur, audientibus et spectantibus omnibus Angelis, et aliquibus Apostolis quos voluit Deus esse nuncios et testes de hoc colloquio." Opera, III. 495.

highest, that of serving God in the church, can have no value, save that of being laid at the feet of Jesus Christ. When Peter, though he meant it not, seemed to put those most illustrious of men, and most honored servants of God, even for a moment, on some sort of equality with their Lord, the anxious explanation of the Evangelists is, that he "knew not what he said."¹ And for him whose language would seem to put any name, either in earth or heaven, by that of God's Son, christian charity can offer no other apology: "He knows not what he says."

We do not wish to close what we have to say on this wondrous narrative, (whose charm grows upon us), without adding, after the example of the sacred writers, of the fathers, and of the reformers, some practical remarks to the doctrine we have developed. The first is, the analogy between Christ transfigured and the believer. As we receive his baptism, are crucified and buried, as we rise and reign with him, so also are we sharers in the power of his transfiguration. In its power we throw off more and more the form of a servant, and the infirmities of nature; we cease to be conformed to the world, and are transformed by the renewing of our minds. Christ dwells in us, and is transfigured through us, not only forming the soul more and more in his image, but filling the body with the power of his own risen and glorified humanity, whose image shall be the mould of the resurrection. Nor would we reason down, to a mere human phenomenon, that palé lustre which has so often been seen to diffuse itself over the countenance of dying saints, like the first flush of Christ's glory, or the radiance on Stephen's brow, when "all that sat in the council saw his face as it had been the face of an angel."² (Acts 6: 15).

We shall close this article with a few reflections on Peter's words: "Lord it is good to be here." In a high sense, these words were true. It is a precious privilege to witness Christ's glory, and to commune with the spirits of the blest, precious, even here to do so by faith, though the veil is between, and in heaven it will be unutterable bliss.

But christianity has something higher to offer to man than happiness. It offers him *duty*, and teaches him, that toils and sufferings must not be avoided, even for religious enjoyment.

¹ "Præposturum, ejus votum fuit, quod finem visionis non teneret: deinde stulte acquavit Domino servos. . . . Valde perversum fuit, Eliam et Moysen Collegas fingere Dei Filio: quasi non omnes in ordinem cogi necesse sit, ut solus ipse emineat." Calvin in loc.

² "Then, then, the triumph and the trance begin,
And all the phoenix spirit burns within."

A quietistic rapture, dwelling in contemplation alone, is not the condition to which it would lead man, but it says: "WORK while it is day."¹ The enjoyment of Christ must be connected with his service, and the system which would resolve christianity mainly into a series of joyous excitements, is unhealthy and ultimately destructive of itself. And if, in our church relations, we think we see Christ more nearly and gloriously, than those whom we confess to be disciples indeed, but whom we yet regard as at the foot of Tabor, and not with us, on the top, let not this nurse in us that exclusive and sectarian spirit, which would make us wish to rear our tabernacles, to keep Christ and his nearest servants wholly to ourselves.— Christ will neither be Lutheran, Presbyterian, Episcopal nor Methodist, but "He will be head over all things to the church, which is his body, the fullness of him who filleth all in all."

Peter would spare Christ; but Christ came to suffer, and the scriptures must be fulfilled. Peter would spare himself; but there was a sharp and glorious probation through which he was to pass; a gospel to be preached by him, souls to be delivered, a martyrdom to be undergone. There was a home higher than the mountain top, where the "rest remaineth," and a longer and harder path to reach it; the bleeding feet of the Son of God were first to trace it, and many bleeding feet were to follow, that it might become more and more distinct and easy to pursue in all coming time. There is no communion with Christ so high, that patient duty and suffering will not lead us to a nearer one.

The language of Peter proves too, that our purest longings may be mingled with selfishness, may be inconsiderate and cruel. Will he keep others from seeing Christ? Will he keep the Savior from his glory, delay his entrance again into heaven, that these sinful mortals may gaze in his brightness? Will he keep the saints from returning to their bliss, and all the hosts of God from rejoicing in the tidings that the sorrowing pilgrim has almost reached the end of his journey, and will enter the starry portals laden with the trophies of a world's redemption, and "leading captivity captive?" Ah, he is revealing the secrets of many hearts, of mine, and perhaps of thine! Why, when friends in whom Christ is glorified, are departing,

¹ "Peter loving a contemplative life (*θεωρητικὸν γε ἀγαπήσας βίον*), and desiring more to enjoy its happiness, than to endure the trial connected with the service of others, uttered these words: 'It is good,' &c. But since love 'seeketh not her own' (1 Cor. 13: 5) the Savior declined that which seemed good to Peter."

Origenis Commentaria in Matt. Huets Edit. Paris

1679. Vol. 1, p. 301.

do we hang so fondly on their accents, and say: "stay with us, it is good to be here?" and when riven from us, why will memory so often look backward where faith should look forward? Why do we think of the parting pressure of the hand, the last words of love, the dying moan, and not of the crown, the communion with Christ, their eternal repose and our reunion with them? Why, with desolate hearts, will we continue to stretch our hands toward the home of their rest, and cry, come, come back to our arms? Blessed be God that he will not hear our cruel prayer; blessed are the departed, that we cannot recall them from their joy, or wound their hearts by the knowledge that we are willing to destroy their bliss! No, it is not good to be here! We know not what we say.

ADDITIONAL ILLUSTRATIONS.

I.

CHRYSOSTOM very happily applies the Transfiguration as a token of the glory of believers in heaven. After having spoken in the most rapturous strain of their exalted condition, he says: "But lest you should suppose that all this is but a glitter of words, let us go to the mount where Christ has been transfigured: let us contemplate him shining with that great splendor, even though he shows not the whole splendor of the world to come. For in it he appeared not so exactly to exhibit heavenly things as they are, but with an adaptation to the capacity of his disciples, as the words of the Evangelist show. For what says he? He shone as the sun (Matth. 17: 2). For the glory of incorruptible bodies emits not such a light as this corruptible body; nor such as could be looked upon by mortal eyes; but there is need for incorruptible and immortal eyes to contemplate it. But on the mount he opened to them such a brightness as they could bear without the loss of sight; nor yet could they sustain it but fell upon their faces. Tell me, I pray you, if any one should lead you into some magnificent abode, where all were sitting clothed in garments interwoven with gold, and in their midst should point out one whose vesture and diadem seemed compact of precious gems, and should promise to enrol you in their number, what would you not do to obtain the fulfilment of such a promise? Open now your eyes, and gaze upon that scene, not trodden by men of this kind, but by those more worthy of noon-day glory, and of all that is called majesty; not by men only, but by those who far surpass men, angels, archangels, thrones, dominions, principalities and powers. For of the King himself we cannot speak: so much does his beauty, glory, majesty and magnificence pass all language and all understanding. Tell me, shall we forego such benefits, that we may escape toil for a brief time? Were it necessary to die a thousand times daily, yea, if hell itself were to be borne, that we might behold Christ coming in his glory, and might be numbered with the saints; would it not be well to endure them all. Hear what St. Peter sayeth: "It is good for us to be here" (Matth. 17: 4).

For if he, when he had seen a dim image of the future world, at once renounced all things for the joy of such a vision, what shall be said when the perfect verity shall be before us, when the courts of the heavenly palace shall be open, and we shall look upon the King himself, no longer darkly, nor in a mirror, but face to face, by sight and not by faith?"

Chrysostomi Paraenesis sive Adhortatio ad Theodorum Lapsus I. Opera I. 292. (Parisii, Ad. Migne: 1842).

II.

JEROME intimates his belief, that Moses arose from the realm of the dead, and appeared in his own body. He thinks, too, that the object of the Transfiguration was to give to the Apostles "a sign from heaven," to increase their faith, though he had denied it to the Pharisees. Another opinion has been that the appearance of Moses was like the corporeal manifestation of angels.

III.

The Transfiguration powerfully sustains the doctrine of the Evangelical church in regard to the person of Christ. "As fire penetrates glowing iron, permeates, embraces and fills the whole of it with its substance, and is perfectly united with it, without confusion of substances; and as the soul is placed in the body; so the Logos assuming true human nature, and in true humiliation, shines in it entire, and the nature assumed, or as it were, kindled by that light, has been united with the Word. For in this way and in such a form Christ appeared in vision to John (Rev. 1), since the fulness of the Godhead dwells in Christ bodily (Col. 2). Thus (Matth. 17) in the transfiguration, rays of divine glory shone forth from his body, and Luke 5: 6, and 8, divine virtue went out from him."

"The Son (Heb. 1) is called the brightness of the Father's glory, to wit: as "light of light," and the light shone from his body (Matth. 17, Acts 9.). Hence Justin takes this similitude, as the light first born, created on the first day, was afterwards united on the fourth day with the solar body, becoming incarnate as it were, and forming one sun, one light; thus may we speak of the divine nature of Christ which was eternal, uniting itself to the human which was formed in time, thus composing one person, who is at once Son of God and Man."

Chemnitz de Duabus Naturis in Christo. (Witebergæ, 1623). 25, 29.

IV.

One of the most remarkable controversies that ever arose in the Christian church, was connected with the light on Tabor. The Hesychasts or quietistic monks on Mount Athos, a sort of compound of Quaker and Mesmerist, held that "there was a light in the soul which could be developed in connection with a bodily glory, by sitting in retirement and gazing in holy meditation on the pit of the stomach. When asked what kind of light it was, they said that it was the glory of God, such as had appeared at the transfiguration. Barlaam, who was a hunter of heresies and had gone on a labor of love, searching for them like Dr. Syntax after the Picturesque, attacked this custom and doctrine, which soon found a defender in Palamas, subsequently Archbishop of Thessalonica. It was found necessary, in order to end the contest,

to hold a council at Constantinople (A. D. 1341), in which the Emperor and Patriarch presided. Barlaam was condemned and compelled to fly from Greece. The first point of dispute was now laid at rest; but the controversy was renewed on the question: "Whether God dwells in an eternal light distinct from his essence, and whether this was the light seen by the disciples on Mount Tabor. The Barlaamites denied this, Palamas maintained it, and eventually triumphed, and his tenet "finally took its place, after a series of solemn deliberations, among the dogmas of the Oriental Church."

See *Büddei. Isagoge.* II. c. vii. § vii. Mosheim, Cent. xiv. p. 2. ch. v. Waddington, ch. xxvi. Fleury, I. xcv. s. q. Schrockh's *Kirchenges.* Th. 34. 433—449. Guericke, (6th ed.) II. 347.

ARTICLE V.

THE EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH, OR HISTORICAL REMINISCENCES, DESIGNED TO MEET THE ANTAGONISTIC TENDENCIES OF OUR AGE AND COUNTRY.

By Rev. J. N. Hoffman, Pastor of the Evang. Luth. Church, Carlisle Pa.

CHAP. I.

THE EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH.

§ 1. HER WRONGS AND DIFFICULTIES.

ALTHOUGH all religious societies have experienced more or less opposition in the world, yet the Evangelical Lutheran Church, above all others, has met the most formidable, protracted and unrelenting hostility. This may be accounted for, in a great measure, on the ground of her priority, prominence and importance; on the ground of her extent, power and merit; on the ground of her doctrine, learning and adherence to the Gospel. That which is insignificant, powerless and without celebrity, elicits no envy, excites no alarm, occasions no opposition. The immense, indisputable and characteristic advantages of the Lutheran church, would naturally alarm the fears of a Godless world, awaken the jealousy of petty sects, and draw forth the opposition of the less favored religious fraternities. Accordingly we find, that from the commencement of her struggle with the Papacy, she has encountered a general, secret and open resistance; in every age she has met with opposition from individuals, governments and sects, and the most artful schemes have all along been employed, to limit her influence, injure her character and destroy

her usefulness. Though persecuted, she was not forsaken; wounded, she was not overcome; crushed, she was not destroyed. Her borders might occasionally have been contracted, but the inextinguishable vigor of her life was only the more concentrated; an occasional repulse she might incur, but she gathered strength from every defeat; a storm of desolation might pass over her, but when the dark cloud had been dispelled, it but revealed a purer sky, a more healthy atmosphere, a more vigorous life.

As these statements refer exclusively to our own country, we cannot detail the continued, repeated and severe sufferings which the church endured in Europe, not only from Papists but also from so-called Protestants. Passing over all previous injuries, we simply allude to a most gross outrage inflicted upon her, by the King of Prussia, in our own times. The king is professedly a member of the Reformed party, which was comparatively small in his kingdom. Without any regard for the rights of the Lutheran church, he undertook to alter the religion of his subjects, to prescribe new articles of faith, and by coercion, to unite the two confessions in one ecclesiastical organization. Most of the Reformed readily acquiesced in the arbitrary scheme of the king; but the great body of the nation, which belonged to the Lutheran church, endeavored to avert a change which violated their faith; but they found no sympathy in the king and his hired ministry. The Reformed could lose nothing by the change, and were therefore more favorable to the union.¹ But to Lutherans, nothing less than the truth of the Gospel was thereby jeopardized. By means of honors, distinctions and reward, a few leading men were brought out to favor the union.² Those Lutherans who resisted, were either fined, imprisoned or deprived of their living. Many suffered the greatest hardships, rather than abandon their faith; some languished in want and

¹ It is a significant fact, that the Reformed in Europe, as well as many in this country, are more favorably disposed to the union, than the Lutheran. This, however, is the natural tendency of a system, not only fluctuating in itself, but affording no satisfaction to its friends. He that is fully persuaded of the truth of his religion, will offer up his life, before he abandons it. What confidence can a person have in the truth of his system, who is ever ready to abandon it for another? Truly a significant fact.

² We might mention some great names of personages, who for the sake of courtly favor, high stations and dignities, were led to favor that unhallowed union, which a modern divine of Europe implored them not to contract, over the remains of the sainted Luther. These very men seem to mourn over the desolations of Zion, even whilst they seem to be utterly unconscious of the fact, that they, themselves, contributed to such results. Witness the recent statement of *Tholuck*, on this subject.

poverty; others went into voluntary exile, and even came to America, where they found spiritual as well as civil liberty. Among eight thousand churches, about seven thousand were exclusively Lutheran.¹ All these churches, with all their church-property, were taken from the Lutherans. Unbelievers, rationalists, graceless men, who could cringe and fawn upon royalty, and sacrifice the truth and the church for the sake of a living, took possession of the churches, as the reward of their base treachery. A system of doctrines was introduced, altogether at variance with the received standards. This system was so lax, vague and unscriptural, that the most lamentable results soon followed, so that the nation at large became infidel in principle, and sunk into vice and sin. For many years, this system of persecution and proscription had been carried on; whilst all true Lutherans, as believing christians, protested against it, but protested in vain. At a later day, however, the king found that he had been fighting against God, that all his schemes would fail, and that if he persevered, it might endanger his own life. As he found that he could not command the consciences of men, contrary to the word of God, he again gave the Lutherans a bare permission to preach; but up to this moment persists in the gross injustice of withholding their churches and church-property from them. This instance, among many others, is here introduced, only as an example of what Lutherans have suffered, from various sources, in the old world.

Whilst the wrongs of the church in the old world proceeded both from civil oppression and religious bigotry, her difficulties in this country were chiefly occasioned by the latter. No other religious society has suffered in the same manner, and to the same extent, as the following condensed description will show.

At an early period, we lost whole congregations and churches. This occurred in relation to the first Lutheran churches, established by the Swedes, in the east. The Episcopalians asked permission to preach in those churches, which permission was granted to them, in consequence of the want of English ministers in our church; only, however, as a mere temporary arrangement, and without any suspicions on the part of the honest Lutherans of that day. Soon, however, the Episcopalians found means, first to secure the members, and afterwards to bring the property into their possession. Several of these

¹ "Theologisches Votum eines Juristen." We have not the means to specify the number of Lutherans in the Kingdom of Prussia, previous to the union. It would be interesting to have a statistical account published, of the number of Lutherans in the various provinces of the old world.

churches are yet in existence, and are held by that denomination, and no doubt constituted no small portion of that basis, on which there was subsequently reared, the imposing fabric, which forms the present strength of that society.¹

In other instances large congregations were scattered, and valuable property wrested from the Lutheran church;² by shameless impostors under the garb of Lutheran ministers. By assuming the name, and professing the doctrines of the church, they found access to our congregations; by the most finished, designing knavery, they imposed upon the ignorance of the people, and soon manifested principles which subjected them to the excluding sentence of the church whose name they dishonored.

The prevalence of the English language, and the want of English ministers in our church, became a fruitful source of difficulty and injury. In some instances the introduction of the English language created contention and division. Vast numbers of the descendants of German Lutherans, being either imperfectly acquainted with the German, or too vain to speak the glorious language of their ancestors, abandoned the church, and united with some other denomination, as pride, policy or interest dictated. This occurred especially in several of our large cities, where the exclusive pride of aristocratic society, attracted the vanity of rich Germans, causing them to conceal their origin, discard their language and abandon all their former associations. The opposition of the Germans to English preaching, in some instances, excluded a sufficient number to form the basis of separate congregations, among other societies.—Many different churches were built up by the continued defection of our members through this cause. In this manner our loss was formerly very great; though at the present day, the difficulty is mainly obviated, as we are now enabled, by means of our theological seminaries,³ to supply our churches, to some extent, with qualified and efficient English ministers.

¹ If we examine the present condition of the Episcopal church, especially in our large cities, we will find, that many of her most prominent and efficient members, have been reared and trained in the bosom of the Lutheran church. Much of their success in this country may be ascribed to the previous culture, which many of her members received in the Lutheran church.

² e. g. in the city of Baltimore, where the first, largest, and most valuable church was wrested from Lutherans, by foreign adventurers.

³ Although a religious institution had previously existed in the north, yet little had been done for the church in the middle States, until the Theological Seminary and College at Gettysburg, Pa. were established. From that period the church assumed a different character. And whilst we cheerfully admit the zeal, industry and piety of our German forefathers, previous to that period, as laying the foundation for a more efficient development, yet it cannot

Another peculiar, powerful yet unaccountable circumstance, frequently encouraged a separation from our church. This was nothing else than foolish prejudice and even contempt respecting the German, in regard to his intellect, character and religion. Because he could not accurately pronounce, or correctly speak the English language, he was regarded as an ignorant boor, whilst his reviler never suspected the fact, that his own total ignorance of the German, would, on the same principle, subject him to a similar charge.¹ Because he had been accustomed to a different mode of life, different habits and dispositions, from those of the more wily Englishman, he was at once condemned as an unworthy character.² Because his modes of thought, habits and feelings in religion, were more free, open and public, than those of the designing and practiced professor, he was at once pronounced destitute of religion.³ We can scarcely account for the strange prejudice that generally prevailed. Such was its power and influence in popular society, that the children of wealthy Germans were ashamed of their Teutonic origin, and for the sake of avoiding the prevailing sentiment of scorn or ridicule, did not hesitate to sacrifice every consideration of birth, language and religion.

It gives us but little satisfaction, also, to state, that at the very time, when Lutherans first required English preaching; at the very time which marked a turning point in the church; when the feelings of many prominent men were not yet alienated from the church, and when thousands of valuable members and their descendants, who now constitute the glory of other sects, could have been retained and secured; at this very time *we were destitute of the men, whom the emergencies of the age required.* The first pioneers of Lutheranism, some of whom preached in five different languages, and who could submit to any toil and make any sacrifice for the cause of Christ, had ended their labors, and obtained their reward.—

be denied, that a new, and more active element of life was infused into the church, by the institutions of the General Synod. From that period, a more active piety prevailed; and whatever may be said in regard to those institutions, it will remain an indisputable fact, that the length and breadth of the church has experienced the salutary influences, *proceeding from that source.* And though, we may regret certain tendencies, simultaneously developed there, yet, we hope, and have reason to believe, that ultimately all will terminate in the prosperity of the church.

¹ See the chap. on Characteristics of the Germans.

² See *The religious character of the Germans.*

³ See Characteristics of Germans.

(These chapters are to follow).

Many of their successors lacked the prerequisites to continue the work. Some, through opposition to English preaching, were glad to see the most valuable members desert them, who desired the English, so that they might not be troubled with their importunities. Others were too much engrossed with the world, to submit to the humble work of building up the church; and the men were wanting, who, in the spirit of their master, were ready to labor, suffer and endure all things, for the sake of the Gospel of Christ. A few, who were sensible of this state of things, and deplored the condition of the church, made some efforts to remedy the evil; but meeting with little support, their best designs were frustrated. In this manner, the favorable period passed away, and the loss became irreparable. We do not feel disposed to analyze the motives, or examine the inducements, which withheld or prevented the relief, when it was so pressingly urged. It is a period, in the history of our American church, upon which we might drop a tear, to blot it forever out of the records of time!

But the severest injuries and heaviest wrongs, which the church endured, arose from sources yet to be specified. And first, we notice the constant, diversified and peculiar exertions of proselyting sects. These wild, erratic and antagonistic societies, surrounded us on all sides, assailed us in every conceivable form, and assumed every possible character for the sake of effect. It was deemed meritorious to turn a Lutheran from his church; to make him a proselyte was to convert him; to change his church-relations was a passport to Heaven.—They appealed to the lowest passions of the ignorant; they flattered the cupidity of the worldly; they awakened the prejudice of the contracted. Their leaders, ignorant of theology, unacquainted with history, and puffed up with self-sufficient pride, gloried in being uninstructed by man, in being taught immediately by the Spirit of God, and in a kind of special inspiration, that rendered them so superior to “college-bred” or “man-made preachers.”¹ The holiest ties of nature were vi-

¹ When we first entered the ministry, our greatest difficulties arose from the efforts of itinerants, who continually strove to limit our influence, by representing us as a “man-made preacher,” as “college-bred,” &c.; whilst they gloried in being instructed *immediately* by the Spirit; that they could preach without human *learning*, and that all who were not qualified in the same way, were “unconverted” and “money-preachers.” But, what changes time will produce! The very men, who formerly denounced all intellectual improvement, so long as they were destitute of means to found institutions of learning, so soon as they were able, established their colleges, and adopted those very means, to qualify their ministry, which they had formerly deprecated. As a natural consequence, nothing more was said of “college-bred”

olated, the sanctuary of domestic life invaded, and the rights of man despised, to gain their ends. When they succeeded in causing strife among others, they sang songs of praise; the separation of husband and wife, as one or the other was proselyte, was but obeying the behest, not to be unequally yoked; the tears of the church were the marks of their triumph. We have seen them laugh in the pulpit, when the ignorant, in fanatical excitement, crowded the altar. Their worshipped idol was *self*; their controlling genius, was religious bigotry; the consequence of their unhallowed course, was moral ruin and desolation. The Germans and their descendants, being an honest, industrious and prosperous people, whose moral worth and religious tendency of soul were undisputed, these were eagerly sought after, hypocritically caressed, and gladly received. The Lutheran church was regarded as common prey; each sect endeavored to secure the largest portion, whilst they often quarreled among themselves, in the division of the spoils. Like as Pilate and Herod became friends in their common opposition to Christ, so we have known two distinct sects unite in a crusade for proselyting purposes; though it generally terminated in a quarrel, at the winding up of the ridiculous farce, each claiming the greatest number of converts. The means that were occasionally practiced, would at the present day, scarcely be credited.¹ The most wily schemes, cunning arts, and deep-laid stratagems, (*"μεθοδία,"* Eph. 4:14) were employed to create doubt in the mind of Lutherans, in reference to their doctrines, experience and church-relations, to cause divisions in our churches, and proselyte their members. To assail the character, motives and piety of our ministers, was to preach the Gospel. Their piety was often graduated by the strength of their lungs; whilst ignorant, vulgar abuse, synergism and anecdotes, constituted the sum total of their preaching. This picture, horrible as it appears, is not exaggerated. In some respects, the delineation is even beneath reality, as it applies to the state of things some twenty-five years ago. Recently, however, this difficulty is also vanishing. Some of those sects have essentially changed their *modus operandi*, and

preachers, after their own institutions had been established. The christian philosopher learns an important lesson from these facts!

¹ Although we cannot furnish a parallel to the case mentioned by Schiller, in his "Abfall der Niederländer," of a Reformed minister, who paid certain women to feign themselves sick, in order to be cured by him in a miraculous manner, yet we have witnessed scenes equally degrading, and equally disgraceful, which were professedly enacted for the sake of turning certain prominent members from their church.

as a necessary consequence, are declining in a correspondent degree. Other sects are rapidly going into an unavoidable decay, as the intelligence of our church advances, and her inherent energies are called into active exercise. And the great and solemn truth, is beginning to be recognized, that "every plant which my heavenly Father hath not planted, shall be rooted up," Matt. 15 : 13 ; whilst our own church is beginning to realize the promise of her Lord : "Fear not, little flock, it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom."

But among all the injuries which the church has suffered, the greatest, the most continued and general, arose from the misrepresentations of our doctrines, proceeding from some of the most prominent persons and denominations of our land.— And whether these misrepresentations proceeded from ignorance, policy or enmity, in every case they are inexcusable and disreputable. Although the church has ever strictly adhered to the acknowledged essentials of religion ; although her sublime Confession has all along been received as the exponent of her faith, and although the historical details of more than three centuries attest her fidelity to the truth of the Gospel, yet all this has failed to silence her gainsayers. The church at large has been traduced ; her ministry denounced, and her doctrines perverted. At the very time when they were drinking from the pure fountain of the church ; when they were profited by her unequalled literature, they essayed to cloud the stream whose transparency surprised them. To give but a single instance, among many others ; who does not know with what pertinacity, how repeatedly and generally, the church has been charged with holding the absurd doctrine of *consubstantiation* ? In vain have we repeatedly, publicly and energetically protested against the charge ; in vain have we declared that this doctrine never was taught, believed or tolerated in the church, that it was irreconcilable with our symbols, and rejected by our ministers ; in vain have we appealed to the history, the whole history of the church, to the testimony of a large number of Lutheran divines, and even to the writings of prominent theologians of Germany, who were *not* in connection with our church ; all this united testimony was disregarded ; and although we can refer to the declarations of historians from the origin of the controversy,¹ to prove the contrary, yet to the present moment the slander is extensively promulgated. Nu-

¹ See *Magirus*, *Widerlegung*, &c., 1592, pp. 17, 153.

Vide præsertim, *Bucer's* account of a conference between himself and the preachers of Zurich, in 1538, in which this doctrine is decidedly rejected at that early period, as utterly inconsistent with our Confession.

merous books are sent forth into the world, whose pages are disgraced by repeating the calumny. The charge was made and published in Europe, by *Edgar*, in his "Variations of Popery," a work which contains some truth, mingled with much one-sidedness and historical inaccuracy: and the American editor of this work, Mr. Sperry, did not hesitate to repeat the miserable tale. And, what is more astonishing still, this work was recommended to Lutheran readers, by the so-called "—— Observer"!! Who is not acquainted with the strange misstatements and errors, respecting our doctrines, which are contained in "Buck's Theological Dictionary"? From this obsolete production, which in a former age of intellectual dearth, was extensively circulated, the people are startled to learn, that the church, that very body, which has struggled most, suffered most, accomplished most, against the Roman Hierarchy, differed least from the Papacy. In the compends of *Goodrich*, and in a number of minor catch-penny productions, the same errors and perversions are retailed, whilst their authors and publishers thereby afford a painful lesson of the effect of religious bigotry, leading them to sacrifice truth, and propagate error.

The same want of moral honesty and sincerity, is exhibited in the unwarrantable liberties, which the translators and publishers of German works have assumed. It was not enough, that they published misrepresentations in their own works, but they must needs so mutilate the productions of Germans, as to make them correspond with their own; just as though the whole church in this country, was either too ignorant to discover the trick, or too imbecile to expose and resent the imposition. Whilst it was found expedient to make the public acquainted with the superior literature of the Germans, it was deemed important also to prevent the effect, which their profound theological research would have, in opposition to the views of translators, publishers, and those like them in sentiment and feeling. In some instances, when German works were translated, which could not possibly be curtailed or altered without destroying the whole production, care was taken,—if those works contained any thing in opposition to the views of the author and his sect,—to caution the reader, either in a wordy preface, (which afforded abundant proof that they were incapable of understanding the author), or in numerous marginal notes, in which they spoke of the matter, as though their own opinions were infallible.¹ And in order to be certain of

¹ See "*Knapp's Vorlesungen*," where the translator attempts frequently to

their intended end, they would insinuate, in the most artful and covert manner, their suspicions, as regards some of the author's opinions! In the translation of other works, not only sentences, but whole chapters were omitted, because they contained a defence of doctrines, contrary to the translator's opinions, which defence, the translator was unable to refute, and therefore withheld it from the public.¹ In some instances, it was deemed politic, not only to omit essential parts of the original author, but also to make such alterations and additions, as entirely to conceal or alter his meaning.² And not a few of these productions of German mind are so completely changed by wilfulness or ignorance, that in many instances the sense of the author is utterly obscured, and even entirely perverted.³ In the absence of means to counteract influences so numerous and general, a settled prejudice was produced against the church; and, in this manner she suffered serious injuries.

convict the author of error, and tries in his notes, to prevent the impression, which on certain prominent topics, the author's investigations might make; whilst in some instances, he entirely mistakes the meaning of the original.

See also "*Neander's History of the Church*," during the three first centuries, translated by *Rose*, who as a strict Episcopalian, makes a feeble attempt to confute the author's views on the subject of *Bishops*; and, to destroy the author's influence, in an indirect and covert, yet perceptible manner, insinuates, that because certain essential doctrines are not so prominently exhibited, the author *might* not be strictly orthodox.

Now if these works are worth the translation; if they contain important investigations, why not give them to the public, without note or comment? Why warn and guard the reader against their views? Are all readers incapable of judging, and have the translators alone, the right and the qualification to decide? We hesitate not to say, that such a course is not only *unjust* to the author, but a *fraud* upon the public.

¹ Such was the case with "*Sartorius' Christologische Vorlesungen*," in which an entire chapter on the Lord's Supper, is omitted.

² Who does not know what "*Mosheim's Church history*" has suffered in the hands of his bigoted translator, *McClaine*? We will not waste time, or even paper, to detail the discreditable bigotry, and miserable imposition of the author.

³ To give an instance of the *littleness* of mind of which some men can be guilty, we refer to the translation of "*Schiller's thirty year's war*," by *Morrison*. Here we not only find numerous omissions, additions and alterations, but also unmistakable proofs of a religious prejudice, that entirely perverted the meaning of the author. The term "*Reformed*," is generally rendered *Calvinist*, especially when it could be done so as to confer honor upon the latter. He often changes "*Lutheran*" into "*Evangelical*" or "*Protestant*," and vice versa, so as not only to obscure the sense, but if possible to misrepresent the Lutherans. In some instances, in which *Protestant* or *Evangelical* is employed in the original, in connection with something unfavorable, he invariably translates them *Lutheran*, so as to throw the odium upon the latter alone, to the exclusion of the *Reformed*! And such is the general nature of the translation, that a reader, not acquainted with the original, would receive impressions, diametrically opposite to those, which would be occasioned by reading the German.

Nor did English writers pursue a more generous and honorable course. The works of English ecclesiastical historians, both foreign and American, with few exceptions, contain numerous historical and doctrinal statements, which are inaccurate, and calculated to exhibit the church in a false light.—This applies, among others, to D'Aubigne's history of the Reformation. Whenever the course of history does not bring him into conflict with his favorite opinion, he *tries*—amidst unmistakeable French levity¹—to be correct. But when he comes to a statement of the developments of history, in regard to matters in which he had taken sides, he ceases to be correct, fair and impartial. His whole representation of the sacramental controversy, bespeaks a mind that was fettered and trameled by sectarian bias.² A German critic, after having given a favorable view of this work as a whole, says of this part of his history, that he displays a more profound knowledge of the Swiss reformation, and especially of the French, than of the German; and that he is not only utterly unhistorical in exhibiting the French Reformation, as occurring simultaneously with that of the German, but also treats of the former with an undisguised partiality; that there cannot be imagined a more superficial, vague and bagatelle-like delineation, than he has given of Luther in the sacramental controversy, not particularly because his representation is Reformed, but because it is a mere schoolboy affair, and exhibits the whole matter in the light of a mere *bagatelle*.³

The general *result* of these varied, numerous and general misrepresentations, may easily be imagined. A settled and very extensive antipathy toward the church prevailed. German authors, whose language and writings were not understood, were suspected.⁴ German theology was cried down,

¹ Which his exulting endorsers of the East, who were glad to avail themselves of his misstatements, have designated a *lively, active evangelical spirit*. Alas, how much we miss the profundity of thought, the dignity of language and strict conscientiousness of German writers.

² As an instance of his want of truthfulness, he says that even Seckendorf, the great apologist of Luther, admits that Luther was of a stubborn, unyielding disposition. In referring to the passage in Seckendorf's history, I was surprised to see the very opposite statement. Seckendorf, referring to Maimburg, a Catholic writer, who wrote against Luther and the Reformation, says: "nor is it true, as Maimburg says, that Luther was of a stubborn" &c. Such a blunder, in one professing to be a historian, is unpardonable. Other historical inaccuracies could be specified.

³ Guericke and Rudelbach's Zeitschrift, 1849.

⁴ Even a late Sabbath School book, entitled "Letters on Ecclesiastical history," speaks of Germany as the country "where infidelity has had her stronghold." Now why single out Germany, whilst among other nations infidelity

German ministers regarded as rationalists, and the whole Lutheran church was exhibited as greatly corrupted. In short, the idea prevailed, *that Germans were the authors of the prevailing infidelity in Europe and America, and that the Lutheran church, as connected with German Theology, was generally affected in the same way.* One of the most recent statements of this kind, which we quote for its gross vulgarity and unhistorical character, taken from an ephemeral periodical of the East, that shall remain nameless¹ here, that it may not be disturbed in its repose of *insignificance*, is the following: "Unless all associations be imaginary, AND ALL HISTORY A LIE, the doctrines of grace cannot long abide, where the bodily presence is maintained in any form. Either they will fall suddenly away, as in the Lutheran church, or (and this is the more natural course,) they will be thrust down, smothered and killed outright, by the influence of a succession of issues from the doctrine of the presence."

This daring, blundering extract may serve as an example of the learning, elegance of diction, and moral sentiment, which have been enlisted against us, in this dishonorable crusade.

Now, in opposition to the general opinion before described, and reiterated in the preceding extract, we will refer to some historical data, which will afford another proof that a guilty person will sometimes endeavor to divert attention from himself, by shifting the blame upon another. We will not enter into any argument on the subject: we will simply adduce facts, together with their authorities; these shall speak for themselves; shall testify in behalf of the church. God knows, that we do not bring these things to mind, out of a mere love of controversy, or through religious bigotry. We have been so long abused, misrepresented, injured: long have we endured it without complaint, without an answer. And as the very opposite is true, that neither rationalism, Socinianism nor infidelity arose in the church, or even in Lutheran countries; as the very sects who continually reiterate these charges, are represented by authentic history as the fountains from which these poisonous exhalations arose, it is not right that the public should be misled, or that the innocent should suffer. If the follow-

originated and still exists? Is Germany more infidel than France? Did not infidelity originate and prevail in England and France? Why not mention the Netherlands, Poland, Switzerland, &c. It is in this manner that Germany and the Germans are constantly vilified, whilst Reformed nations more infidel still, are not mentioned.

¹ Simply stating the fact, that the Editor professedly belongs to the German Reformed Church.

ing statements are sad and painful, let it be remembered, that they are UNDISPUTED FACTS, *again forced into notice by continued, unprovoked and unrelenting hostility.*

In the first place we remark, that the prophetic ken of Luther foresaw and predicted the necessary results of those systems, which occupied a position in contrast with his own churchly stand-point. A certain historian remarks: "Luther perceived that the view of the Lord's Supper, which represented it as a mere act of remembrance, would, as a necessary consequence, at last terminate in the rejection of the essentials of religion."¹ Other writers refer to these fears of Luther, as increasing to the end of his life. "In the latter part of his life the apprehension became vivid in his mind, that the representations of Calvinists respecting the Lord's Supper, would prepare the way for that system, which we at the present day denominate rationalism, but which Luther regarded as downright infidelity."²

Let us now examine whether the prophecy of Luther was verified. Impartial history shall furnish the answer; first, in regard to the earliest appearance of gross error, and then to the origin of those anti-christian tendencies which subsequently became more general in Europe.

In the Palatinate, the Lutheran doctrine had prevailed at an early period. Soon, however, Frederick II. and especially Frederick III. of the Pfaltz, both of whom had become converts to the Reformed religion, began to oppose the Lutheran and advance the Reformed church. As the latter prevailed, error ensued; and history specifies the cause and the effect. "The Elector Frederick, of the Palatinate, was soon to find that this view (the Calvinistic), among men who were not thoroughly penetrated by religious sentiment, would readily become the occasion of positive ungodliness. For, as it cannot be denied, that *in this doctrine, the influence of reason predominates* to a far greater extent than in that of the Lutheran, it was not at all strange, that this influence would usurp authority also in other matters. Accordingly, we find that the *divinity of Christ*, and in consequence, the doctrine of the *Trinity*, were secretly attacked by the Palatine divines."³ It is singular that all historians, few of whom can be charged with any partiality to the church, agree in this representation. "It is remarkable," says a modern writer, "that immediately after

¹ Leo, Lehrbuch d. univ. Geschichte, b. 3, p. 145.

² Marheinecke. Kirch. Gesch.

³ Leo. Lehrbuch d. univ. Gesch. B. 3, p. 318.

the introduction of the Heidelberg Catechism in the Palatinate, a tendency arose, which not only opposed the Lutheran view of the Lord's Supper, but also proceeded to attack the divinity of Christ, and the Trinity," &c.¹ So peculiar and confined to anti-Lutheran systems, were these defections from the truth, that the charge was openly preferred, "that Calvinism opens the way for Arianism and Muhammedanism;"² and that the going over to Calvinism would naturally lead to the rejection of the divinity of Christ.³ The instances which furnished the proofs for these historical representations, and which led the historian to assert, that "the opposition to the faith of the church * * * had found a home (Freistatt) in Reformed countries,"⁴ because as numerous as they were notorious. So undisputed was the fact, that another writer declares: "I do not at the present time know a single Arian, who had not before been a Calvinist;" and after mentioning the names of a number of persons who had renounced the latter for the former view, he adds: "therefore, if any one desires to escape Arianism, let him shun Calvinism."⁵ Among the number of those, whose erratic course is above alluded to, we mention the case of *A. Neuser*, as one of peculiar note. He had been a somewhat prominent preacher in Heidelberg, but having exposed himself to danger on account of his Arian heresy, he fled to Constantinople, and became a Turk.⁶ From this place he wrote to D. Gerlach, that he had been led into error through Calvinism; and cautioned others to avoid that system.⁷ The undisputed, undeniable testimony of history, thus demonstrates that the first appearance of heresies after the Reformation, arose in Reformed countries; and all unite in ascribing it to the same cause. In Geneva, the Palatinate, the Netherlands, France, Poland, and other places, in all of which the Reformed system prevailed, these consequences followed.

¹ *Guerike*, Kirch. Gesch. vol. 3, p. 553, sixth ed.

² *Andrea*, disp. "Quod Calvinismus viam aperiat Arianismo et Muhametismo."

³ *Henke*, Kirch. Gesch. vol. 3, p. 545

⁴ *Hase*, Gesch. p. 463.

⁵ *Gerhard*, disp. "Nullus nostro tempore mihi notus factus est Arianus, qui non antea fuerit Calvinista. . . . Igitur, qui sibi timet, ne incidat in Arianismum, caveat Calvinismum."

⁶ *Guerike*, vol. 3, p. 553, note.

⁷ *Magirus*, "Widerlegung des Sapientisten," &c., p. 63. Neuser wrote to Gerlach, among other things: "Qui vult vitare Arianismum, caveat Calvinismum."

We do not wish to be understood as preferring charges; we merely quote undisputed, notorious facts. Nor do we assert that such errors were sanctioned by the Reformed church.—We wish merely to prove, that the reiterated charge, that the Lutheran doctrine leads to such “*issues*,” is false, and that indisputable history exhibits a different source.

Having thus shown the *origin* of these errors, in the age of the Reformation, we will now proceed to exhibit their source, in a later period. And here again, we are led to a similar result.

The gross errors which began to prevail in Germany in the latter end of the seventeenth, and commencement of the eighteenth century, had a foreign origin, and actually arose in Reformed countries. The speculations of a few windy philosophers never could have affected the soundness of Lutheran theology, had not powerful influences from abroad, which first took hold of men who were in authority, and who afterwards aided the more efficiently to spread the poison, by their name, station and power, operated against the faith. “The writings of innumerable deists, who arose in Reformed England; in the end of the seventeenth, and beginning of the eighteenth century * * * began to be circulated in Germany, about the middle of the eighteenth century, in German and French translations.”¹ Here we have the introduction of error from other than German sources. But even this gross deism of England, would not have generally prevailed, had it not been sustained by a new phase of error from a different source. “The trifling, frivolous French deism of the eighteenth century, infected, far and wide, the higher classes of the Germans.”²—Now that infidelity was once introduced, it unhappily found a powerful advocate in Frederick the great. This monarch was surrounded by French infidels, such as Voltaire, Maupertius, d’Argens, La Mettrie and others, and by their combined influence, the poison soon rapidly spread. Such was the origin of the infidelity that prevailed in Germany. It will be seen that it did *not* arise in the bosom of the Lutheran church, but was introduced from Reformed sources, sustained by infidels from Reformed countries, and aided by a monarch, whose dynasty adhered to the Reformed religion.

If any additional proof were needed, we might refer to the present religious condition of countries, almost exclusively

¹ *Guerike*, vol. 3, p. 478. Vide et Henke, vol. 9, p. 487, seqq.

² *Ibid.* vol. 3, p. 479.

Reformed. Let us commence with England, and having witnessed the effects of her infidel productions, let us pass over into France, and observe that frivolous, volatile nation almost universally given to infidelity ; then let us pass through Holland, the Netherlands, Hungary, the Palatinate, Poland, until we light upon Switzerland ; then let us examine the condition of Heidelberg and Geneva ; and, as we pause in this theatre of Calvin's fatalism, and Servetus' horrid death, let us turn a brief look to Bremen and Berlin, and the dark shades in the gloomy picture are completed ; we have testimony sufficient, that neither Lutherans, nor Lutheran countries, nor the Lutheran religion, produced the sad "issues" so frequently charged against us. If such a charge had been founded in fact, and if other systems of religion possessed an inherent antidote against the prevalence of error, why is it that the very seats and head-quarters of those systems, first produced heresy, and have since presented a deep-rooted opposition to the Gospel ? In 1817, the theologians of Geneva, could boldly venture to forbid their candidates for ordination, to maintain the union of the humanity with the deity of Christ, and to command them not to preach respecting original sin, and the operations of divine grace.¹ In the same year, the rabble of Geneva, in their furious madness against the truth, uttered the horrible imprecations : "A bas Christ, á bas les religionnaires ! á mort ! á la lanterne !" Such an extreme of blasphemy, no Lutheran country ever yet produced. In Lausanne, a liberty-tree was erected in 1845, as the signal of vulgar opposition to Christ, as the rabble exclaimed ; "behold here the tree of liberty ; be still about your Christ."²

We again remind the reader that it gives us no pleasure to advert to these facts. But when false charges are so long urged against the church, to our great injury, it is a matter of duty and conscience, to state the actual truth. And if these facts seem somewhat tart, let it also be remembered, that we have been forced to bring them up in self-defence, so that our opponents have themselves to blame. These are melancholy reminiscences, rendered still more so by the superadded fact, that for almost a century, religious bigotry has striven to divert attention from itself, by holding up and exaggerating the imagined defects of the church. Nor should these developments of human nature be overlooked in the history of our race, as they will afford additional illustrations of the truth of the Gospel,

¹ *Guerike*, vol. 3, p. 594.

² *Ibid* vol. 3, p. 597, note.

not only sustaining the doctrine of human depravity, but also, magnifying the grace of God, in devising means for the Redemption of a race so corrupt and guilty.

Such were the wrongs which the church has endured in this country; such the difficulties she encountered, and such the obstacles she had to surmount. A person not acquainted with the result, might naturally exclaim; such formidable, continued and powerful influences, must have overwhelmed the church! But, was this the issue? In the face of all her wrongs and injuries, she has not only escaped annihilation, but gradually triumphed over every obstacle. Her very sufferings nerved her energies, fired her zeal, and ennobled her character. In defiance of sectarian bigotry, prejudice and enmity, her symbols have been maintained, her doctrines promulgated and her borders extended. Her historical *moment*, missionary enterprise and unparalleled literature; her noble champions, her glowing poetry, her ascetic theology, have been the exhaustless sources from which others have drawn; have become the wonder of the knowing, though they often strove to destroy the fountain, after they had slaked their thirst. And, at the present time, the church has assumed a character, and is putting forth an energy, that, aided by her historical, indisputable advantages, she looks forward to a development, extent and influence, that will place her, where she ought to be, in the very centre of the sacramental host of God, as the mighty standard bearer, in the struggles of Zion.

ARTICLE VI.

PAUL GERHARD.

By John G. Morris, D. D., Baltimore, Md.

SUCH frequent allusion has been recently made to Paul Gerhard in various journals, and so many of his incomparable hymns have been translated into our language, that an introduction to the nearer acquaintance of this "sweet singer of Israel" may not be unacceptable to the lovers of sacred poetry.—Besides this, there is evidently a growing disposition to become more familiar with the illustrious men of our church of the olden time, and that man would render an eminent service who would reproduce their portraits in life-like colors and

set them before us in all their brilliant array. What a gallery of distinguished worthies! What a *Walhalla* of the great and good and wise of the three last centuries!

As a theologian, a preacher, and above all, as a sacred poet, Paul Gerhard will be remembered and revered, by the Lutheran church and all other German communions, in all ages and in all lands. Uncounted numbers of pious worshippers are every Lord's day edified by the singing of his hymns "in the great congregation," and multitudes are daily encouraged in their most holy faith by the private reading of these admirable productions.

Gerhard is more to the German churches than Watts or any other poet to the English. His hymns are more numerous and not less spiritual. They are less liable to dilution and adulteration, and are ingrafted into the very constitution of German worship. We might dispense with Watts quietly, but a revolution would be necessary to exterminate Gerhard. There are other German sacred poets, and of the highest style of excellence, it is true, but Gerhard is the mighty master, before whom they all bow in reverential submission.

He lived in troublous times. From his twelfth to his forty-second year, the bloody 'Thirty years' war desolated the fairest portions of Europe. Fire and sword, famine and pestilence laid waste her proudest cities and ruined her most fertile provinces. The tocsin of war sounded terribly all over the land, and death and destruction followed in the train of the infuriated foe. Protestant and Catholic were arrayed against each other in the deadly fight, and as is usual, in all religious wars, the unholy strife was carried on with the most unrelenting barbarity.—But there was another contest that raged most violently during the life of Gerhard. Protestants were engaged in virulent controversy among themselves. Lutherans and Reformed were discussing in most unamiable temper the hair-splitting distinctions of their respective creeds. It was not alone the Professors in their chairs, nor preachers in their pulpits, nor writers in their books, but the common people themselves, who were carrying on this logomachy with the fiercest acrimony. The most rancorous hate, the most bitter malignity, the most vulgar personal and denominational abuse, characterized this controversy. The whole Protestant church of Germany was in a blaze, and all the alienation of feeling and the disruption of fraternal ties usually attendant on violent theological warfare, were universally felt.

One may well suppose that this was not a period suited to the gentle spirit of Gerhard, but he lived through it all and

was even compelled to take no inconspicuous part in it. In the seasons of deepest dejection, he would grasp his harp and sing as David did, to lull the tumult of his soul and soothe the anguish of his wounded spirit. His deep piety for a long time seems to have protected him against the perils of the word strife of the schools. He never lost sight of the only star that guides the believer to the haven of peace and never elevated mere scholastic orthodoxy above holiness of heart and life. It may be also, that foreign influences were exerted upon him, and that the reading of Arndt's True Christianity, which had just then appeared, preserved him from the contamination so rife around him. But a poet is not apt to be dragged down from the summit of Parnassus into the dirty arena of theological strife. His soul disdains such inharmonious pursuits. He dwells in another atmosphere and holds communion with more refined spirits.

During the whole Thirty years' war, Gerhard was without a pastoral charge. He was over forty years old before he had the care of souls. He gained his subsistence by teaching and spent his leisure hours in writing poetry. The horrors of war, the sufferings of his countrymen and the afflictions of Zion were fruitful themes for his pen. He regarded the war as a judgment of God on the guilty nations, for they had degenerated into the licentiousness of the heathen.—In flowing numbers, sweet as angels' voices, he calls on the people to turn their hearts to God. Like the prophet Joel, he warns them against still greater evils, and when at last, the storm is over—the thunder of artillery no longer reverberates through the land—the conflagration extinguished and peace again scatters her blessings all around, the poet breaks forth in most enrapturing strains. He calls on the people and the church to snatch their harps from the willows and send aloft a shout of praise to the God of their deliverance:

Wohl auf, und nimm nun wieder,
Dein Saitenspiel hervor,
O Deutschland! singe Lieder
Im hohen vollen Chor.

During this period of suffering, Gerhard was himself often in personal peril. It was after escaping imminent danger on one occasion that he wrote that beautiful hymn,

Wach auf, mein Herz und singe,
Dem Schöpfer aller Dinge,
Dem Geber aller Güter
Dem frommen Menschenhüter.

Every remarkable event of his life was the occasion of some admirable poetical effusion, and all so pious, so lovely, so divine. He was in constant intercourse with God, and the more gloomy were his prospects, the more profound was his confidence and the more bright his hopes of heaven. The greater his need the nearer was he to God.

After untold anxieties and sufferings in being driven from place to place and earning a poor subsistence, he at length found a comfortable situation as private instructor in the family of Berthold, an officer of state in Berlin. It was a pious family, the children of which had been trained in the fear of the Lord. Gerhard was now a happy man. — He had a home among those who sympathized with him as a christian, and appreciated his talents and labors as a poet. There was one member of the family, who especially harmonized with the tenderest emotions of his heart. An accomplished poet and a handsome, intelligent young lady dwelling under the same roof are apt, it is said, to betray extraordinary sensibility towards each other in a very short period. Love and poetry are intimately associated.

Frederick William, the great Elector of Brandenburg, had taken a decided stand on the Reformed side of the theological discussions of the day. The majority of his subjects were Lutheran, and they were mortified to desperation, to see the Elector and the Court promoting the cause of the Reformed with all their influence and authority. Reformed professors were appointed to vacancies in Lutheran theological Faculties, and other unmistakeable evidences of the Electoral preferences were given. Gerhard, as a strict and conscientious Lutheran, regarded all this with fearful apprehension. He was nearly forty years of age, and was as yet nothing but a bachelor candidate. He feared that the probabilities of success in Brandenburg, under such a government, were but small; and how could he expect to consummate his most ardent wishes and establish a home for himself? He daily saw one before him who would adorn a palace. Anna Berthold was lovely in his eyes. Besides possessing uncommon attractions of person and mind, she was truly pious. The Scriptures were her daily companion, and she had an extraordinary gift of prayer. She was a dutiful and affectionate daughter, and a pattern of every filial virtue. She was not indifferent to the constrained attentions of the poet, but could he, a poor man — a dependent preacher — a destitute instructor of a lawyer's children, aspire to the hand of his patron's daughter? — here was a struggle — a season of extreme solicitude! — It was a poet in love — a

christian poet, whose passion was moderated and refined by high christian principle, but the emotion was still strong as death. But he submitted to God. He looked beyond this life and revelled in the anticipations of a blissful eternity.—About this time, he was also severely afflicted by sickness, and amid these multiplied anxieties, he wrote that incomparable hymn:

Warum sollt ich mich den grämen, &c.

It was thus that almost every circumstance of his life drew forth some beautiful hymn. His feelings naturally flowed out in verse of the most tender character.

Fierce temptations often assailed him—"the pains of hell gat hold upon him—he found trouble and sorrow," and who but Gerhard, in such a state of mind, could write that most noble composition,

Schwing dich auf zu deinem Gott,
Du betrübte Seele,
Warum liegst du Gott zum Spott,
In der Schwermuths-Höhle?
Merk'st du nicht des Satans List,
Er will durch sein Kämpfen
Deinen Trost, den Jesus Christ
Dir erworben, dämpfen.

But we are not to suppose that all his hymns were of the same melancholy tone. Joy and gladness often filled his pious soul, and he warbled forth his extacy in most thrilling song. His *Lob- und Dank-Lieder* speak the fervid emotions of his grateful spirit, and they impart to the reader a portion of the same blissful feelings. The most profound gratitude, the most ardent love, the most cheering hope fill his heart. Penetrated with these emotions he hails the advent of the church, in that imperishable hymn:

Wie soll ich Dich empfangen,
Und wie begegn' ich Dir?
O aller Welt Verlangen!
O meiner Seelen Zier?
O Jesu, Jesu, setze
Mir selbst die Fackel bei,
Damit, was Dich ergötze,
Mir kund und wissend sei.

The coming of the Savior, with the benefits of his redemption, is represented in most glowing language,—the poet's soul glows with fervor as he hails the rising of the Sun of Righteousness on a darkened world.

The Thirty Years' War had terminated. Peace was proclaimed. Dilapidated churches were rebuilt—exiled pastors

were restored—vacant parishes were filled—schools were reestablished—trade and commerce revived—agriculture was resumed, and yet there was no station found for Gerhard. All his attempts to gain a place were fruitless. His heart was cast down, but to this circumstance we owe that excellent hymn:

*Ich hab' in Gottes Herz und Sinn,
Mein Herz und Sinn ergeben, &c.*

Never were pious resignation to God's will—complete subjection to His sovereignty—perfect patience under disappointment and sorrow more beautifully and impressively uttered than in that hymn. We do not think it possible for human language to express a more thorough acquiescence in the decrees of Providence. This was the character of Gerhard's piety, and to be in all things of the same mind with God, is the perfection of piety.

He did not in vain admonish himself to patience. Daylight begins to appear after a long night of gloom,—the horizon is streaked with the first blush of the morning—the hill tops are gilded with a roseate hue,—hope comes to the bosom of this mourning son of song.

But, before we accompany him in this new career of life, let us take another view of him as a church poet. Until now, his hymns were accidental and personal. They were occasioned by the times, and were the breathings out of his own religious experience. They were such as every poetical genius writes in the retirement of his closet, and which are never designed to see the light or be published to the world. But Gerhard was to become the sacred poet of his own and of future times.

The Papal church, since the fourth century, had possessed a rich treasure of hymns. Many of these are of the most exalted and refined character—deeply spiritual and full of poetic unction. But they were all written in the Latin language, and of course unintelligible to the common people. The priests alone sang them at the altar, and the people were not edified by these sacerdotal solos. It was the Reformation by Luther that restored this department of public worship to the church. The language of the people became the language of the church, and when Luther published his own hymns, in an incredibly short time, all the Evangelical churches resounded with their melody. The arches of the old cathedrals reverberated the joyful sound as it went up from thousands of happy worshippers, who were not prevented by false delicacy or natural imperfection of voice, from giving full vent to all its force. Luther's hymns were also sung in the private resi-

dences of the well conditioned citizens and in the cottages of the poor peasants. Every where was heard the voice of the singers, for their tongues were loosed by the power of the truth. The church invited the nations to join the anthem of praise, and cried out, "O come, let us sing unto the Lord a new song; Let us heartily rejoice in the strength of our salvation." The nations heard, and as the chorus came sweeping over the land, they joined their voices, until it became universal.

Other men, such as Weisse, the Hermanns, Selnecker and Ringwaldt, had written hymns before Gerhard, which were extensively used in the churches. Gerhard revered his poetical brethren of the church, and was influenced much by the deep pathos and elevated piety of their church songs. Some of his most exquisite compositions are evidently founded on some of theirs, but in style, in metre, and in every thing else external, they could no longer be models for him. Whilst they were natural, popular, and suited to the times, they were, in many instances, disjointed, unmelodious and rough. Gerhard made a wonderful improvement in smoothness of versification, in purity of style, in beauty of language, and in propriety of figure. Whilst there was more art, there was no less of nature than in his predecessors; he was more ornamental, though no less popular; he was more refined, though no less vigorous; he was more melodious, though no less spiritual. The improved times called for improved church hymns. He labored for Zion as a poet, even if Providence did not open a way for him as a pastor. Though he afterwards labored as a preacher, yet it is Gerhard the poet whom we especially know. As his reputation as a sacred poet rose, the Lutheran ministers of Berlin now began to appreciate the attainments and poetical genius of the obscure private teacher. They particularly admired his strong adhesion to the Lutheran confessions in those days of presumed, if not real, persecution. They gave him an occasional opportunity of preaching in their pulpits. He became popular as a preacher, for he was now well known as a poet, but his godly life contributed more than all, to gain for him the respect of the people. In all these things he probably anticipated an approaching change in his outward circumstances. His clerical friends all encouraged him with hopes—he needed encouragement, for he was now forty-four years of age, and still a homeless candidate. But he did not despair. He trusted in God, and wrote the hymn,

Ich singe Dir mit Herz und Mund,
Herr, meines Herzens Lust—

This time his hopes were not destined to be disappointed—his persevering confidence was to be rewarded. A vacancy occurred in a neighboring town, and the magistracy of the place requested the Ministerium at Berlin to recommend a suitable person to fill it. They unanimously recommended Gerhard without his knowledge, and he was elected.

We may well imagine with what feelings he received this call. After twenty years of patient waiting and trouble, his object was at last gained—his mind was at peace, and he gave utterance to his feelings in a beautiful hymn.

On November 18, 1651, he was ordained, and on that day signed the following declaration in the Ordination Book:—"In the name of the Holy and Indivisible Trinity,—I confess and declare that the doctrine which is embraced in the unaltered Augsburg Confession and its Apology, in the Schmalkald Articles, in the Catechisms of Luther and the Form of Concord, is established distinctly and firmly on the foundation of the Scriptures, and that, by God's help, I will adhere unchangeably to this faith to the end of my life."

With this confession, which was made with the most profound sincerity, he entered on the discharge of his clerical functions, at Mittenwalde. He had exalted views of the responsibility of his office, which in that day was no sinecure in the Lutheran church. The Sunday sermons required an uncommon degree of preparation. It was necessary that they should bear the marks of mature study, and the taste of the times demanded that they should be of a full hour's duration. No baptismal, funeral or matrimonial service was performed without the accompaniment of a long discourse. The communion was administered every week. The communicants were numerous, and every one of them had a private interview with the pastor. The young people were catechised twice a week, and besides all this, numerous pastoral visits to the sick and others, were to be paid. We can hence, have some idea of the multiplied labors of Gerhard in the first year of his ministry. He had not much time to indulge his natural inclination to poetry, but still, genuine poetical talent cannot be altogether suppressed by outward circumstances. There are few or no poets by nature, who ever wholly break their harps or hang them on the wall. Gerhard occasionally sung in the midst of all his pastoral engagements and anxieties, and by degrees, the latent poetic fire burnt forth in all its original vehemence.

With all his fame as a poet—with all his popularity as a preacher—with all his attainments as a theologian—with all

his strong trust in the Providence of God, he still felt there was something wanting to complete his happiness. He felt uneasy—he looked around him and within him for the cause. He could find none; at length he came to the conclusion that it was his solitary life, and if he had one to share his anxieties, he would be perfectly happy. Anna Berthold was still unmarried, but could he, a clerical bachelor of forty-five, expect to gain the hand of the young lady of twenty-three? After long deliberation, and prayer and trembling, he succeeded. Then came forth that splendid paraphrase of Prov. 31, in which the wise man characterizes a virtuous woman. Gerhard has put it into beautiful verse, and Anna was the model.

He was married on February 11, 1655. He conveyed his bride to his humble home, deeming himself the happiest man alive. His apprehensions that the youthful bride would encounter many inconveniences and privations in the confined limits of his village parsonage, were realized. Her husband's numerous engagements often left her in dreary solitude, and she longed after more congenial society than the place afforded. Gerhard observed her disquietude, and sought to cheer her melancholy spirit by striking the wires of Zion's harp. He wrote an ode suited to her state of mind. She recovered her cheerfulness, and discharged all her domestic duties with a lively assiduity, and was in all respects a perfect pattern of a christian housewife.

But domestic sorrows were also allotted to Gerhard. The happiest family is also called on to mourn. The loveliest earthly Paradise also bears briars. The death of his first born overwhelmed him with grief. We have no hymn referring particularly to this melancholy event, for it doubtless required all his faith and time, by prayer and exhortation, to support the crushed spirit of his wife.

There were other sources of uneasiness and anxiety. His increased expenses—a small income—the dejection of his wife, together with unpleasant official relations to his colleague, weighed heavily on his mind. These, and other difficulties grew daily. Anna saw no hope of relief—she anticipated the severest privations—she went about mourning all the day.—Gerhard preached consolation, and quoted that beautiful passage, Ps. 37: 5. "Commit thy way unto the Lord: trust in him also, and he shall bring it to pass." Full of this sentiment, he retired to the garden, and there, under an arbor, wrote that well-known hymn,

Befiehl du deine Wege.¹

¹ For a good English translation of this hymn, see this Rev. No. 5, p. 135.

It consists of twelve stanzas, each beginning with a word of the scriptural passage. The whole is most admirably managed. He brought it in—read it to the disconsolate wife, and no wonder she was comforted. It expresses the most complete submission to the divine will, and the fullest confidence that God would send deliverance from all their sorrows.

On the evening of the same day, a messenger delivered to him a large sealed letter from the magistracy of Berlin, the very sight of which greatly alarmed the nervous and sensitive Anna. Gerhard broke the seal and read it. It was a call to the diaconate of St. Nicolai in Berlin! He re-read it with tears—all his anxieties about support were now at an end. In the rapture of his heart, he said to his wife, "see how God provides!—did I not say, 'commit thy ways to the Lord!'"

But he did not rashly accept the call. It was only after much deliberation, that he yielded to the solicitations of the magistracy, and in July, 1657, he removed to Berlin. Fervent prayer, deep searching of heart, and self-abasement characterized his entrance on the duties of his new station. It was then that he wrote that sweet hymn,

Ich weiss, mein Gott, dass all' mein Thun, &c.

He moved among a people who loved him—his colleagues revered him—the whole christian community respected him. The first five years were passed without any extraordinary trials. He was, however, afterwards deeply afflicted by the loss of several children. Every father will feel the full force of the following stanza of a hymn, written on such an occasion.

Ach! wie muss doch ein ein'ges Kind
Bei uns auf dieser Erden,
Da man doch nichts als Bosheit find't,
So hoch geschonet werden.
Wie hitzt, wie brennt der Vatersinn
Wie giebt, wie schenkt er alles hin,
Eh' als Er an das Schenken,
Des Ein'gen nur will denken.

During this period, he appears to have written many of his finest compositions, and to have attained an extraordinary celebrity.

But the lute of song was not the only instrument on which he was called to play at Berlin. There was another which he was compelled to grasp. It gave out no sweet sounds—it breathed forth no melodious notes. Its tones were rough, discordant, unmusical. It was the war trumpet of the polemic.

The relations of the Lutheran church in Brandenburg, were, at that time, peculiar and critical. Gerhard was devoted to her

interests with all his heart. The difficulties with the Reformed had not diminished. The Elector favored the latter, and many of his measures were regarded by the Lutherans as oppressive, and restrictive of the liberty of conscience. Thus, for instance, Pomarius was for a time suspended from office for a sharp attack on the Reformed Court Preacher, Bergius, and was at last totally discharged and exiled, for a sermon against the Reformed faith. All this, and more that might be mentioned, only tended to establish the Lutherans more firmly in their creed. The theological war raged most fiercely—the churches resounded with most unlovely anathemas—the pulpits were the arena of a furious gladiatorship—the presses groaned under the weight of the *heaviest* books, and the whole country was in a heat of polemical wrath. After many futile proclamations to peace on the part of the Elector, one of which even forbade his subjects to study at the Lutheran university of Wittenberg, he at length ordered a conference to be held between the Reformed and Lutheran Theologians of Berlin and Cologne, on the Spree. Gerhard took an active part in it.—The conference met. There was much parleying, and even dodging, before the preliminaries were settled, and much cross and bush fighting after the contest began. It was a long time even, before they determined which point, precisely, to fight about. The doctrine of the Lord's Supper was finally hit upon. The combatants entered the arena—the signal was given—the contest raged fiercely for a while—blow succeeded blow, but after all, for the most part, it was blows in the air. There was more noise than pain—more words than wounds. They finally agreed to stop the discussion, and mutually vowed, that whilst each party would most pertinaciously adhere to its dogmas, yet that they would show each other all christian respect, and most heartily desire each other's salvation! With this they might have been contented, but it was not only peace which the Reformed desired—it was union, and the Lutherans were expected to make concessions. This occasioned another long discussion. The Elector became impatient, and he took no pains to conceal his displeasure with the Lutherans. They did not yield, and even the electoral displeasure could not bend their sturdy necks. Gerhard was a prime combatant in all these various and protracted controversies, and during this period, we see but few hymns from his pen. Can there be any thing so uncongenial with poetic inspiration, as acrimonious, theological controversy? The war finally terminated, and like most others of a similar character, each party was only the

more firmly convinced of the truth of his position, and the less inclined to love his dissentient brother.

Gerhard's theological writings, which this controversy elicited, are said to display a masterly exhibition of the Lutheran system, associated with extensive learning, vast comprehensiveness of view, acute discrimination, and wonderful polemical skill.

He had leisure now for the more special discharge of his pastoral duties. His new born son, Paul Frederick, gladdened his heart—but he was not without domestic troubles. His father-in-law's death deeply afflicted him. After a season of tranquillity, the ecclesiastical horizon again began to be covered with portentous clouds. The Lutheran clergy trembled, for an edict was issued by the Elector, forbidding the clergy, on pain of deposition, from charging any of their brethren with false doctrine—from condemning opposing parties—from deducing any mischievous result from positions maintained, and he ordered, moreover, that exorcism in baptism should be left to the choice of the parents of the baptized child.

This edict was manifestly aimed at the Lutheran clergy, and of course, it occasioned among them a general alarm. They saw that their liberty of conscience was invaded, and they held it to be their conscientious duty to maintain the purity of their doctrine, and hence, also, publicly to refute false doctrine, and by proper and logical inference, to show its dangerous results.

Gerhard, and most of his clerical brethren, were in a dreadful predicament. They did not wish to disobey their lawful sovereign, nor, on the other hand, could they respect the edict, which they regarded as manifestly against the word of God. In this state of alarm, they presented an humble petition to his electoral grace, beseeching him to allow them now, as formerly, unrestricted liberty of conscience, and to grant to the Lutherans, the same privileges which even the Romish church enjoyed. The petition was contemptuously thrown aside, and an order was at the same time issued, that every man of them should bind himself by a written pledge, to follow out the edict, on pain of dismissal from office. Many clergymen of the country signed the declaration—many others hesitated long.—The Berliners would not decide for themselves, and asked the opinion and advice of the theologians of Leipzig, Helmstadt, Jena, Wittenberg, Hamburg and Nurnberg.

The opinions of these learned men were various. The scruples of the Berliners were not removed. In the meantime, they sought to escape the pledge by silence. But the Elector was not to be put off—he was not that sort of man. He heard

of their asking foreign theologians whether they, his subjects, should obey his laws, and this enraged him. He conceived that herein they showed mistrust and disobedience. He was not to be trifled with, and immediately ordered the recusants to appear before the Consistorium, there to deliver up the recorded opinions of the foreign theologians, sign the declaration, or be deposed. Two days after, the order was somewhat modified. Only two of the recusants were ordered to appear—time was given to the others for consideration, but final disobedience was to end in dismissal. On the appointed day, two of them were cited. Gerhard accompanied them! They could not say, as Paul said on an analogous occasion, "no man stood by me." The aged Lilius, and the unyielding Reinhardt refused to sign, and they were deposed. Gerhard and the others were threatened with the same punishment. Notwithstanding the alarming example made of Lilius and Reinhardt, they determined not to sign. They declared this to the magistrate, and besought him to use his influence with the Elector, to have the two deposed ministers restored, without signing the pledge. The magistrate interceded. The clergy, at the same time, presented a petition, promising also to send, in a few days, their conscientious scruples, which they humbly hoped, the Elector would respect. A curt, repulsive reply was given, and even the declaration of their scruples, sent in, a few days after, was ungraciously received.

Naturally much alarmed at this, they renewed their petition and promised to refrain from all severe crimination of their opponents and made such other concessions as the edict required. In a word, they yielded. They were not prepared at that time to lose their places, their bread, and, probably, their lives for their theological dogmas.

If the Elector had been impartial in this affair, he might have been satisfied with their acknowledgment. But he was not. He was pledged to one of the parties, and was as bigoted in his faith as were the Lutherans. Still the business had to be settled. The deposition of two worthy ministers had created much excitement. It was regarded as a direct attack against the liberty of conscience, and, particularly, as an assault on the Lutherans. The people complained that the Reformed faith was to be forced on their consciences, and that the Lutheran worship was to be obstructed and changed. These complaints became so loud and general, that the Elector felt compelled, by a public proclamation, to dispel these apprehensions of his subjects, and to justify his conduct towards the two expelled ministers. This encouraged the magistracy and citi-

zens to renew their petition for the restoration of these men. The Elector granted it so far as to give Lilius further time for reflection, but as for Reinhardt, who was the prime disturber of the church's peace, he was exiled on the spot, and the others were to hold themselves in readiness to sign. Reinhardt left the country, and his former colleagues in vain, once more, declared their peaceful intentions.

The Electoral legislature now interfered and besought His Grace to exercise moderation. They brought up various acts of the government, that seemed to justify the course of the clergy. Measures were adopted in concert with the Elector to settle the dispute, but they could not agree upon the exact mode. In the mean time, the Council or Legislature adjourned. The Elector went to Cleves and thus the matter was left undecided.

Gerhard had determined from the beginning, not to sign the declaration. He now hoped to escape it altogether, but when he reflected on the resolute character of the Elector, he was still full of apprehension. He looked forward with dread to the time, when he, like Reinhardt, should be turned away without a home, or bread or hope.

Some time after this, the aged Lilius was induced to recant, —he signed and was restored. The Elector, in his letter to the Consistorium, particularly designated Gerhard as one of the most obstinate, and ordered him to be cited. He appeared and was informed of the Electoral will, —sign or suffer. He refused. Though charged with contumacy, eight days were allowed him for deliberation. At first, he accepted of the proposition, but immediately after, said that he had considered it long enough and would not change his mind! In the name of the Elector he was deposed, and Paul Gerhard ceased to be the minister of St. Nicolai!

We need not be in doubt, how he received this long threatened blow. His confidence in God was not shaken, but how could his sickly, desponding wife, endure the disaster? A general sympathy was felt for him, —the people were overwhelmed with grief at the thought of losing such a gifted pastor as Gerhard. They united with the town councils in a petition in his behalf. The petition was forwarded to Cleves. The Elector replied that he knew nothing about the remarkable piety of Gerhard, for which he was so highly extolled in the petition, —he only knew that he was an obstinate, stiff-necked Lutheran, who would not sign himself and influenced his colleagues to follow his pernicious example, and that he did not regard this as any evidence of piety, —he must sign or quit the country.

The publication of this reply alarmed and excited the citizens. They met together and consulted. They renewed their most earnest petition. It was unkindly received. The Elector charged the petitioners with sedition, exaggeration and even falsehood, and he forbade the officer to hand in any other petitions from that quarter.

All access to the Electoral favor was now hemmed up. An application from the Council even met with similar treatment. Nothing was left for Gerhard now, but for his congregation and numerous friends to show their sympathy, and by their liberality to secure him against want. Thus deposed, what was he to do? He turned again to his long neglected harp, and once more tuned its strings and sang, if possible, more sweetly than ever.

Eleven months were thus passed. His friends in the meanwhile, gathered round him, and he did not suffer, at least, for the necessities of life. — The Elector returned to Berlin. — He sent for the magistrate, and ordered him to reinstate Gerhard!! He even sent his own private secretary to inform him of the fact, which was an act of extraordinary favor and condescension. The joy was general, and Gerhard was the only one who did not participate in it. Although he resumed a portion of his official duties, he would not take upon himself the whole. He feared the Elector was under a false impression of his position, and that he had changed his views with regard to the Form of Concord, for he would not purchase his restoration at the expense of even suspected change of principle. — The result of the whole affair was, that Gerhard could not conscientiously re-enter on his office with the conditions annexed by the Elector. His fate was now decided, — he took leave of his attached people, and retired again into the privacy of domestic life.

An edition of his hymns was published, and it is likely that he derived a portion of his support from that source. He continued to write, and maintained the same simplicity — the same accommodation to the popular feeling and comprehension, that distinguished him from the beginning. He sustained a truly national character, whilst the secular poetry of the Germans of that day was an affected imitation of foreign models, full of conceit, exaggeration and bombast.

His congregation could not be persuaded to give him up. They still hoped to have him restored, and hesitated about calling a successor. Thus he lived, beloved and honored by his congregation and admired by the whole christian population of Berlin.

He was soon called to part with his beloved Anna, and this was the severest trial of his life. — In the meantime the Elector had relaxed the rigors of the edict, but it was still not satisfactory to Gerhard and he could not avail himself of the Electoral favor.

He was afterwards permitted to accept a call from Lübben, though in his sixty-second year; he was not kindly treated at this place, and after seven years of anxiety and toil among an ungrateful people, he died in peace on the 7th of June, 1678. He had lived a pious and godly life, and he has left him in his incomparable hymns a monument more durable than brass.

ARTICLE VII.

LITERARY AND THEOLOGICAL INTELLIGENCE.

GERMANY. The death of Otto Von Gerlach, which took place at the close of the last year, excited universal regret amongst the friends of Evangelical religion, in his Fatherland. He was a truly pious and able minister of the New Testament. His Commentary on the Old Testament was unfinished at the time of his death, but the remaining volume will be prepared by a competent hand. A very interesting biographical sketch of this eminent servant of God is contained in the December number of Hengstenberg's *Evangelische Kirchen Zeitung*. Otto von Gerlach was born in Berlin, April 12th, 1801, and died in December, 1849. The narrative in Hengstenberg closes thus: "G. after he reached maturity was not more than twice seriously ill, and both times, contagion from attending the sick was the cause. Consequences of the first of these attacks threatened his physical frame, which had thus far been vigorous, very seriously, and indicated death. He returned from a long sojourn in Silesia, during the Summer, in which he associated, with the care of his health, benevolent agency, in a condition not improved but worse. Heavily oppressed, he felt his end certainly approaching, but nevertheless employed himself in new labors for the winter. Notwithstanding his affliction and the positive prohibition of his physician, he yielded to the desire to appear in the pulpit on the 20 p. Trin.—after a long absence from it. With more than usual life, fire, he preached on the wedding garment, without which no one can be admitted to the marriage supper of the Lamb. But zeal for the house of God broke him down; he returned home exceedingly ill; three days afterwards he died. *Voluit, quiescit*, this may be his Epitaph: his be the rest which he regarded and sought as the highest good! His heavenly Father has given him rest from his toils."

The April number of the *Studien u. Critiken* contains the following articles:

I. Aristotle's sensuous theory vindicated; a contribution to Christian Apologetics, by Dr. Roth, of Schönthal: II. On the Development of the System of Morals in the Reformed church, by Dr. Schweitzer, of Zurich; a second contribution on the subject, bringing the history from Amyrdaus to Wolf: III. The Exodus of the Israelites from Egypt to the Red Sea; a critical dissertation by Professor Stickel, of Jena, with a map: IV. The Exegesis of Acts 10: 35, 36, by E. Pfeiffer: V. Exposition of Romans 5: 6, seq. by J. A. Kunze: VI. Review of Solomon's Temple, by Bähr: VII. a Review of Nevin's "Mystical Presence," by Ebrard: VIII. The Original Relation of the Church to the State within the limits of Evangelical Protestantism, by Dr. Daniel Schenkel. 2d article.

The January and February numbers of *Harless' Zeitschrift für Protestantismus und Kirche* have been received. The January number contains, 1. a Contribution to Christology, which is a defence of his views, by Dr. Thomasius, in answer to objections made by Dr. Liebner, in a notice of his articles on that subject in former numbers of the *Zeitschrift* — afterwards published in a separate volume.

2d. A short History and Estimate of the value of the different editions of the entire works of Dr. Martin Luther. This we consider a highly useful article, now that the works of Luther are so much sought after. We will endeavor to present it hereafter in our review as a guide to those who may desire to obtain the works of the immortal Reformer.

3. Some contributions to the article: "Die innere Mission und ihre Stellung in der Kirche," in the November number of the *Zeitschrift*.

The contents of the February number are, 1st. Thoughts on the Word and Sacraments; 2. Defence of Protestant Missionaries; 3. The Sect of Irving; 4. The Irvingites, "or we are not Protestants;" 5. Theological Aphorisms. This to us is decidedly the most interesting of our German religious periodicals. Dr. Harless, recently called to fill the place of Court preacher at Dresden, once filled by Spener, is known as an orthodox and pious divine — decidedly symbolical in his tendencies. A powerful preacher and an eminent biblical critic, he occupies, at the present moment, a most attractive position. All eyes are turned to him and much is expected of him in his new sphere of labor. The successor of Von Ammon, who followed Reinhard, he may be expected to exert an influence in favor of orthodoxy and vital piety, which could have had no encouragement under his rationalistic, predecessor and were exposed to powerful counteractions under the more orthodox, able and excellent Reinhard.

The Co-editors of the *Zeitschrift* are Dr. J. W. Fr. Hülfling, Dr. Gottfried Thomasius, Dr. J. Chr. K. Hoffmann, Professors of Theology in Erlangen.

The first volume of Hengstenberg on the Apocalypse has been published and come to hand. It is a stout volume, containing 632 pages. The second volume will appear during the current year. The first forty-eight pages are taken up with discussing the time at which it was written; and the author unhesitatingly ascribes it to the reign of Domitian near its close, the author, of course, John the Apostle. The work is much less combined with exegetical material than we expected, although it presents all the results of the

most thorough learning, and can be read with the deepest interest, by the intelligent layman, as well as by the learned divine. Bengel is a great favorite with the author and is frequently cited by him, though his views of the Apocalypse are essentially different from Bengel's. It cannot fail to be highly satisfactory to all who have not determined that they must find each important event of history foretold in this wonderful book. It is a book for the heart as well as for the head. We shall anxiously look for the remaining volume, and then may furnish an extended review of the whole. In the meantime, we can recommend it to those who desire something good on a too much neglected portion of God's word.

K.

Zeitschrift für die gesammte lutherische Theologie u. Kirche. The first No. of this able Review for 1850, contains a more than usually varied collection of articles. The first, by Superintendent *Dr. Frantz*, is a notice, based upon the Minutes of their proceedings, of the Conference of the members and friends of the Lutheran church, held at Leipzig on the 29th and 30th of August, 1849. This article is highly satisfactory, giving a clear view of the proceedings in question, and exhibiting the life and spirit with which the Lutheran church is now exerting itself for its own re-organization throughout Germany.—The second is a lecture by *Dr. Fr. Delitsch*, upon the relation of the prophecy in Isaiah 52: 13—c. 53. to the connected prophecies of the Old Testament which proclaim a Savior.—The third Article from the pen of *Dr. Rudelbach* bears the title, "*Statechurchism and Religious freedom. A historical view of the past and of the future, with an application of the same to the present state of the church.*" The sins of the state against the church are here set forth in a masterly manner, and the natural inference in favor of the liberation of the church from the tyranny of the state unhesitatingly drawn. The fourth Art. by *Rev. Karl Ernst* is upon "*The church and church power. Thoughts on the present projects for new church constitutions; drawn from the confessions of the church. For Lutherans.*" At this we had not time even to glance, though the title is attractive enough.—The fifth Art. by *Rev. J. F. Seeberg*, is "*Rahab, or the lie of necessity*, a contribution to Katechetics, founded upon Jos. 2. Heb. 11: 31. and James 2: 25."—The sixth is an antiquarian notice of some Manuscripts in the library of the Prince of Oettingen, by *T. F. Korrer*.

The bibliographical notices have their usual variety and piquancy. The contents of the second No. for 1850, are as follows:

I. *Essays*; 1) By *A. G. Rudelbach*, *Statechurchism and religious freedom*, Historical retrospects and anticipations: with their application to the present circumstances of the church. No. II.

2) By *L. Wolff*. On Presbyteries; a Synodical Address.

3) By *W. Münchmeyer*. The dotation of the German Lutheran church in relation to its doctrine and its progressive reformation.

4) By *C. P. Caspari*. On the Syro-ephraemitish war under Jotham and Ahaz.

5) By *Fr. Schöving*. Old Testament exegesis. Exodus iii, 21 etc. xi, 2—xii, 35 etc.

II. *General Bibliography of the latest theological literature.*

III. *Church questions and decisions*; 1) By C. F. Caspari. On Pistorius' views in opposition to baptism by Rationalists.

2) By J. Diedrich. For self-examination.

2. *Theologische Studien u. Kritiken*. This periodical appears with great punctuality. We received its third No. from Germany before most of the Reviews in this country for the corresponding quarter had made their appearance. It is superfluous for us to say that it still maintains its well-established reputation as a theological journal. Its contents are the following "*Essays* :

1. *Lücke*: friendly reminiscences of Dr. W. M. L. de Wette.

2. *Creuzer*: on new contributions to Jewish history from Greek historians.

3. *Schweizer*: the development of ethical philosophy in the Reformed church.

And the following "*Thoughts and observations* :

1. *Laufs*: on St. Paul's discourse before the Areopagites, Acts xvii, 22-32.

2. *Böttcher*: addenda to the "Exegetico-critical gleanings from the O. T."

3. *Mertz*: Appendix to the Review of Dr. Bähr's Temple of Solomon.

4. *Müller*: A narrative of occurrences at the Diet of Augsburg in 1530.

A Review of Malon, on the author of the book "*De imitatione Christi*," by von Bähring.

The Ecclesiastical department contains an article by *Heppe*, on the character of the German Reformed church and its relation to Lutheranism and to Calvinism.

Dr. Hagenbach has published his "*Discourse at the funeral of De Wette*" (Rede bei der Beerdigung des Hrn. Dr. u. Prof. W. M. L. de Wette). Basel (Schweighäuser). 8.—The third part of Hävernick's "*Handbuch der historisch-kritischen Einleitung in das alte Testament*," prepared by Dr. Keil of Dorpat, made its appearance last year from the press of L. Heyder at Erlangen, VIII and 52 opp. 8vo. price 2 Thl.—The prolific pen of Rudolph Stier has also sent forth two new exegetical works on the Proverbs under the titles "*Der Weise ein König*," (pp. 305.) and "*Die Politik der Weisheit*" &c. (pp. 146.) both from the press of Langewiesche in Barmen.—The third edition of Dr. Tholuck's "*Alte Testament im neuen Testament*," is published by Perthes in Hamburg—the whole work has been re-written.—The distinguished geographer, K. Ritter, has published the discourse which he delivered before the Scientific Association of Berlin on "*Lynch's Expedition to the Dead Sea*," under the title, "*Der Jordan u. die Beschiffung des Todten Meeres*," pp. 38. price $\frac{1}{2}$ Thlr.—W. Löhe publishes his ideas upon church-government in a work entitled, "*Aphorismen über die neutestamentlichen Aemter u. ihr Verhältniss zur Gemeinde*," 140 gr. 8, 10 Ngr.—L. F. W. Stier writes upon the same subject, "*Die bevorstehende Umgestaltung der evangelisch-protestantischen Kirche*."—A new edition of the writings of Justin Martyr, superintended by J. C. T. Otto, has been published by Mauke in Jena, under the title of "*S. JUSTINI Philosophi et Martyris Opera quae feruntur omnia*."—Wiegandt of Berlin is publishing a new edition of St. Bernard's works (S. BERNARDI Opera omnia. Tom. I. De Consideratione libri V. Curante C. F. Th. Schneider.) 126 pp. small 8vo. price 15 Ngr.—An autobiography of the celebrated J. Val. Andrea, edited by F. H. Rheinwald, has made its appearance under the following title: "*Jo. Valent. Andreae Vita ab ipso conscripta, ve Autographo*" etc. nunc primum edidit F. H. R. cum Icone et Chirographo Andreano." From the press of Schultz at Berlin—price 1 Thlr. 18 Ngr.—Bengel's son has published a new edition of his celebrated father's well known "*Gnomon*," under the following title: "*D. JOH. ALBERTI BENGELII Gnomon Novi Testamenti*," etc. "*Editio tertia per filium superstitem*" etc. adjuvante Johanne

Steudel. — Prof. Piper has edited the "*Evangelisches Jahrbuch für 1850.*" The contributions are from the pens of such men as Arndt, Becker, Henry, Heubner, Krummacher, Lange, Neander, Ranke, Ullman, &c. which ought to be a sufficient guaranty for its general excellence. It consists chiefly of biographical sketches of distinguished christians from the age of St. Paul to that of Martin Luther, written in a popular style. 8vo. price $\frac{1}{2}$ Thlr. R.

Geschichte der deutschen National-Literatur von A. F. C. VILMAR, 4te Auflage, Marburg, 1850.

This admirable work, on the national (poetic) Literature of Germany, has, in a very short time, reached its fourth edition, the last of which, published in four numbers, has just been completed. A few general references will exhibit the character of this work.

The author reduces the Literature of the Germans to three distinct periods. The first embraces the *most ancient* (aelteste) poetry of the nation, commencing about the middle of the fourth, and terminating about the middle of the twelfth century. This period includes the conflict of the ancient national life of Germany, with the genius of Christianity, until the latter triumphed over and penetrated all the elements of German life. It is distinguished by a very ancient, remarkable and truly excellent translation of the Bible, by *Ulfila*, a Bishop of the western Goths. This translation was long held in veneration, forming the basis of subsequent improvements of the German tongue. It had become obsolete and unknown during the dark ages; and was in modern times again made public, through the efforts of German antiquarians. This period likewise gave birth to a number of national songs, detailing in true epic style, the noble and heroic deeds of their chiefs, and forming the foundation of similar productions in succeeding ages.

The second period, which he terms the *old* (die alte zeit), begins in the middle of the 12th century, and ends in 1624. The distinction between the poetry of these two periods is striking, affording an interesting view of the advancement of society in civilization, the arts and sciences. Whilst the national songs of the *most ancient* time exhibit man under the influence of nature, furnishing a natural transcript of his real unsophisticated character, they display also much beauty and pathos. They paid no attention to rhyme or measure, but were accustomed to introduce as many words as possible in each line, commencing with the same letter; as e.g. in a more modern poet:

"Friede dir, freudiger Frost der Nacht
Blinkende blanke Blume des Schnees."

By this kind of alliteration, most of this ancient poetry is marked. But in the second period a marked change occurred. Christianity had now penetrated and modified the general character of Teutonic life; and consequently all their productions, no less than their individual character, experienced an important modification. There is less nature, less of the magnificent and heroic, but more art and regularity, mingled with the elements of a more advanced civilization. This period embraces that distinguished, unequalled and exciting Epic, the so-called *Nibelungenlied*. This "*Epos*," which in many respects equals, and in some exceeds the *Iliad* of Homer, the author describes at large, furnishing us with a detailed history of the startling, terrible incidents recorded in it. It is the grand poem of Germany. We shall prepare a translation for publication. Numerous other poems and fragments of poems are referred to, as the work of this period.

The third period commences 1624 and comes down to 1832, including the real classic period of German Literature. But as this period is more generally known, we need not enter into special description of it. We might add much that is interesting on this subject, and trace some of the characteristics of German life, at the present day, to the ancient habits of that people. Perhaps, however, some one better qualified, will hereafter afford us a more complete and special description of this excellent work.

J. N. H.